

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [27th November 1952]

had the privilege of discussing this with some educational authorities. Anyway, I want the Chief Minister to give one hour's time for discussing this subject. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopachari : 'No, not here'.) It is not a political issue."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, it would be most inadvisable and it will be very bad for the young people of our country if we make such things subject-matter of our debates here. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry to say, went and addressed a meeting on this subject. I wish he had not done it. We will give every consideration to the question with reference to the good of the students concerned and not to score a point in public."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"It is my conviction. It is not politics."

MR. SPEAKER :—"We have a non-official resolution on this subject."

SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI :—"On a point of order, Sir, నేను ఇచ్చిన విరామ తీర్మానం విషయం అజయించిన నోరావు."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Is it a point of order?"

SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI :—"Yes, Sir, నేల్లూరు జిల్లాలో ఈ నాడు ఊరు పరిస్థితులు విస్తృతాయి. పర్వతానంత, వరదలనల్ల కంటులు పాడయ్యాయి. విధి ప్రజలలో ఆకలి చావునకూడా సంభవిస్తున్నట్లు తెలుస్తోంది. ఇంత ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి విషయంగురించి చర్చించవలసిన ఆవశ్యకం ఉంది."

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is not a point of order. Let the hon. Member resume his seat. We will now proceed to the next item on the agenda."

(Some hon. Members rose on a point of order.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"Order, order. I am not going to allow any points of order."

(Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddi rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member will please resume his seat. We will now take up the next item on the agenda."

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952

(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)

Clause 6—cont.

12 noon. * SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name :—

'Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (1) :—

Provided that the tenant shall not claim for continuance of possession for cultivation of more than 6-2/3 acres.'

"Sir, this amendment is a very just and reasonable one. It is quite in keeping with the spirit of the times and in the larger

27th November 1952] [Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao]

interests of food production. Yesterday when I spoke on clause 2, I clearly stated my view point on the matter. Now also I shall say a few words. The main objective that is aimed at in all Governmental undertakings at the present time is stepping up of food production. The Government seem to think that this objective cannot be achieved if a large extent of land is concentrated in the hands of a single individual, namely, the landholder. Therefore, they have restricted the extent of land for cultivation by a landowner to one veli, that is, 6-2/3 acres. I urge that the sponsors of the Bill should put the same limit in the case of the tenant also in the interests of food production and consistency of policy."

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Amendment moved—

' Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (1) :—

" Provided that the tenant shall not claim for continuance of possession for cultivation of more than 6-2/3 acres."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I oppose this amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Government are not accepting the amendment of the hon. Member. I am going to put it to the vote of the House."

(The hon. Member Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddi rose.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" An amendment similar to the one given notice of by the hon. Member Sri Ramakrishna Reddi was rejected by the House yesterday."

(Still the hon. Member Sri Ramakrishna Reddi was standing.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" Will some hon. Member tell him in Telugu that a similar amendment was rejected by the House yesterday and that, therefore, I am not going to allow the hon. Member to move his amendment now? "

Sri P. Ramamurthi explained it in Telugu to the hon. Member. The amendment (of Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao) was then put and lost.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move the following amendment :—

In sub-clause (1), for the words " he shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer " occurring in lines 7 and 8, substitute the words " he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled " . "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Amendment moved—

' In sub-clause (1) for the words " he shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer " occurring in lines 7 and 8, substitute the words " he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled " . "

[27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, the language of the clause is ‘ he shall be entitled to apply ’. There is nothing said about his right itself. So, it is corrected verbally as ‘ he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled ’ ”

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then there is the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Pundarikakshacharyulu. But a similar amendment was rejected by the House yesterday. Therefore, he cannot move his amendment now.”

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ I press my amendment, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member cannot move his amendment. It is out of order. The amendment of the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi is also of the same kind.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ My amendment is different, Sir. It makes a specific distinction between those tenants who were in possession of the land from 1946 to 1951 and those tenants who were in possession in 1951. I do not think it is covered by the previous amendment that was disposed of yesterday.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then, let him move it.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name :—

‘ To sub-clause (2), add the following proviso :—

“ Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession ”.

“ I would like, first of all, to explain what the effect of this amendment is and why it is absolutely essential. This is entirely in conformity with the spirit of the Bill now before the House. The present Bill lays down, under clause 6, that all those tenants who were in possession of any land on the 1st day of December 1951 shall be entitled to possession thereof, subject to the provisions of this Bill, until the expiry of a period of five years from the commencement of the agricultural year 1952–53. No condition is laid down here. All those people who were in possession of the land on the 1st day of December 1951 shall be entitled to be in continuous possession of that land for a period of five years thenceforward. Then, those tenants who were in possession of the lands in the year 1950–51 but who were evicted prior to December 1951, will be

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

restored to such possession on certain condition, that is, provided that the land is not in the occupation of any other tenant who has raised a crop thereon. In other words, if a new tenant is in occupation of the land but has not raised a crop thereon, then the old tenant of 1950-51 will be entitled to reinstatement. These are the existing provisions. I go further and say that those people who have been evicted from 1946 onwards should also be entitled to reinstatement. We know that there will be cases where, in the intervening period, some other tenant might have been in possession of the land. We do not want to-day to disturb that possession. We do not want to harm the interests of those peasants who have got possession of the land between 1946 and 1951, irrespective of the fact whether they have raised a crop at the time when this enactment comes into force or not. In other cases, the people who have been in possession of the land from 1946 must be entitled to be reinstated.

"I would like to explain why we are attaching particular importance to this amendment. In the Preamble of the Bill itself it is stated that this Bill was necessitated as a result of the strained relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other, resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances. Now, it is admitted that the agrarian situation in the district of Tanjore was due to certain causes. It was due fundamentally to the extreme exploitation carried on by the landowners. It is because the landlords were not willing to yield, the agrarian situation became worse. When the peasants started the agitation for a higher share of the produce, then immediately the landowners started evicting them. This process started from 1946 onwards. The very fact that the Government have brought forward this Bill is a clear proof that the claim made by the tenants was just and proper. But the landowners were determined to resist that claim. Even to-day it is being resisted. From 1946 they have been continuously attempting to resist this claim and in their attempt they have been adopting the method known, in trade union parlance, as victimisation. This victimisation has been going on from 1946 and large numbers of tenants have been evicted. Therefore, to-day when the Government try or presume to put an end to the root cause of the trouble, at least those people, who raised the question and who have been fighting over it from 1946, should not be unnecessarily victimised. I should like to tell the Hon. the Chief Minister that he should not look at this question from a political angle. No political issue is involved in this. Here are people who started the movement and who fought for a very just right. So long as the Hon. the Chief Minister admits that their cause was just and their demand was proper, to say that simply because certain people were the agitators of a just cause, they should be victimised and should not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their agitation, is something that is reprehensible. Therefore, the Government should have no difficulty whatsoever in accepting this amendment, and if they refuse to accept it, the only

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[27th November 1952]

12-10
p.m.

conclusion that can be drawn is that political motives are behind it. I say that political motives should not weigh in this matter of giving some relief to the poor peasants. There should be equity. That is the point which I want to stress. The question of the relationship between the landlord and the tenant should be carefully tackled in such a manner that the poor peasants are able to get justice irrespective of the fact whether there had been a movement for getting justice or not. Otherwise, it may be interpreted that those who joined the struggle for getting justice should be victimised. Such a thing should not happen. Therefore, I commend this amendment for the acceptance of this House."

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரித்து நான் சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த மசோதாவை இந்தச் சபையில் கொண்டுவரும்படி செய்வதற்கு காரணகர்த்தர்களாக இருந்து அன்றையதினம் பல அடக்குமுறைகளின் இடையில் விவசாய இயக்கத்திற்குத் தலைமை தாங்கி அதை நடத்தி வைத்த—தென்பரை விவசாயிகளுக்கும் மிராசுதார்களுக்கும் இடையில் தகராறு நேர்ந்த காலத்தில் நிலத்திலிருந்து விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றக்கூடாதென்று ஒப்பந்தத்தை ஏற்படுத்தியது என்று உள்ள சர்க்கார். அதாவது 1945-ம் ஆண்டு டிசம்பர்மீ 25-உயிலேயே ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளும் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளும் மிராசுதார்களும் கூடி ஜில்லா பூராவாக நிலவெளிநீற்றும் கூடாதென்ற திட்டத்தை முடிவுசெய்த அமுலுக்கு கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. அதற்குப்பிறகு 1946-ம் வருஷத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா செஷன்ஸ் ஜட்ஜ் அனந்தநாராயண அய்யரை அப்டீஸ்டேட்ராக நியமித்து விசாரணை செய்யும்படி சொல்ல அவரும் தீர் விசாரித்து எந்த விவசாயியையும் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாதென்று 1946-ம் ஆண்டு மார்ச்சுமீ 13-உயில் ஒரு ஒப்பந்தத்தைக் கொண்டுவர முயற்சித்தார். ஆனால் துரதிருஷ்டவசமாக அப்பொழுதிருந்த காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் அதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ளாமல் முரண்பாடுசெய்து விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே அடக்கிவிட்ட முயற்சித்தார்கள். அதற்குப்பிறகு 1946-ம் ஆண்டு டிசம்பர்மீ 24-உயில் மறுபடியும் ஒரு ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டது. இப்படித் தொடர்ந்தார்ப்போல விவசாயிகளின் இயக்கத்தை மதித்து அவர்களிடையே குறைகளை சர்க்கார் கவனிக்கத் தவறிவிட்டதினால், மிராசுதார்கள் இந்த மாதிரியாக இயக்கத்தில் ஈடுபட்டவர்களையெல்லாம் பழிவாங்க நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். மிராசுதார்கள் செய்துவரும் அநியாயத்தை எடுத்துக் காட்ட நியாயமாகப் போராடிய பல விவசாயிகளிடமிருந்து நிலங்கள் பிடுங்கப் பட்டிருக்கின்றன. பழிவாங்கும் கருத்தோடேயே தான் இந்த மாதிரியாக களப்பார், சிறுகளத்தார், ஆலத்தூர் புதுக்குடி, போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள மிராசுதார்கள், பெரிய பெரிய நிலப்பிரபுக்கள் நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிற களை தவிர தாங்களே சாகுபடிசெய்ய உத்தேசித்து அல்ல. இன்றைய தினம் ராமநாதபுரம் போன்ற பஞ்சப் பிரதேசங்களிலிருந்து வருகின்ற கூலியாட்களையெல்லாம் கிடைக்கக் குறைந்தகூலியில் வேலை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். மேலும் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தில் அந்த நிலம் யாரிடமாவது இருந்தால் அதைப் பிடுங்கிக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் கேட்கவில்லை. ஆனால் நிலப் பிரபுக்களை அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தால் அதைத் திரும்பவும் விவசாயிகளிடம் போய்ச்சேரும்படியாக நாம் சட்டத்தை திருத்தவேண்டும். ஆதலினாலேதான் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு சாகுபடியாளர், 1946-ம் ஆண்டு டிசம்பர்மீ 1-உ சாகுபடி உரிமை பெற்றிருந்தால் அதேததிக்குப்பின் வெளியேற்றப்பட்டாலும் 1951-ம் ஆண்டு டிசம்பர்மீ 1-உ வெவ்வேறாத சாகுபடியாளரும் நிலத்திலில்லாவிட்டாலும் அவர் சமரச அதிகாரிக்கு நிலத்தில் சாகுபடி உரிமை கோரி மனு செய்துகொள்ள உரிமையுண்டு, என்ற திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

27th November 1952]

Mr. SPEAKER :—“ Amendment moved—

To sub-clause (2), add the following proviso:—

“ Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession ”

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the amendment moved by Sri Ramamurthi. While doing so, I wish to point out that in the year 1946-47, the then State Government issued a questionnaire about the proposed land revenue reforms. So the landlords apprehending some agrarian reforms for conferring some rights on cultivating tenants began to evict the tenants gradually and thus there were wholesale evictions in many instances which can be very well seen from the magnitude of litigation pending in the different Civil and Criminal Courts. Subsequently, after the appointment and reports of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee and the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, Madras, there has been considerable agrarian unrest throughout the State, and wholesale eviction of poor innocent peasants has taken place in a number of villages. Hence, we must give effect to this Bill and give relief to tenants from 1946. With these words, I support the amendment.”

* SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ Sir, ఈ చామూర్తిగారు తెచ్చినటువంటి amendment ను బలపరచుట నేను చూట్టాడుతున్నాను. ఎవరిమీదను వారు తెచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు అరవ కాళ్ళలో 1951 వ సం॥ డిసెంబరు 1 వ తేదీన ఏ tenant అయితే భూమిని సాగుచేస్తూ ఉండేనో ఆరెతను యీ యాక్టు అన రణలోనికి వచ్చినప్పటినుంచి మరల భూమిపైనే వెళ్లి, సదరు భూమిని ఆతని స్వాధీనములో పెట్టవలసివదిగా తెలుపుచున్నది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో 1946 వ సంవత్సరములోనే అశాంతి ప్రారంభం అయింది. 1946 వ సంవత్సరములో అశాంతి ప్రారంభమైనప్పడు, అనేకమంది రైతులను భూస్వాములు భూములనుండి తొలగించారు. ఆ తొలగించబడిన రైతుల విషయములో యీ బిల్లులోని ‘ఏ’ కాళ్ళు చెప్పడమే కాదు. ఈ amendment యొక్క అర్థమేమిటగా 1946 వ సంవత్సరములో భూమిని స్వాధీనములో పెట్టుకొని సాగుచేస్తున్న రైతులు ఆప్పటి అశాంతివల్ల తొలగింపబడినట్లైతే, వారిని మరల 1951 సంవత్సరములో సాగు చేస్తూ ఉండే రైతులు మాదిరిగానే, భూముల పైనయండవలసివదిX అర్థము. ఈ amendment చాలా శ్రేష్ఠికరంగాను, modest గాను ఉన్నది. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము వారు దీనిని అంగీకరించెదరని నమ్ముతున్నాను.”

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I warmly endorse and support the amendment that has been just now moved by hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi. According to him and even as the previous speaker said, it is but a very moderate and very logical amendment, if only we carefully study the historical development that has led to the present Bill. What really happened was, there was a large-scale eviction in 1946 and thereafter the process of

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

[27th November 1952]

12-20
p.m.

eviction continued right up to 1952, when the matter became very worse and the Government had to interfere and bring in an Ordinance in the first instance and the present Bill to validate that Ordinance. It is but natural that those who have been victimised in the first instance should also be included under this Bill and given the benefit of the relief measures which are contemplated under this Bill. I don't think there will be any dispute over the fact that evictions did start as early as 1946 and that too on a large scale. It is but natural to expect that when any relief under legislation is given to a certain class of people, retrospective effect should be given from the date on which the mischief started in order to effectively counteract any further possible mischief. Sir, I may state that the amendment brought forward by Sri Ramamurthi is nothing new and we know of many instances in which such retrospective effect has been given with regard to certain beneficial measures. Even in the case of the Madras Agriculturists Debt Relief Act, of which the Hon. Chief Minister was himself the pilot, it was definitely laid down that the provisions of that Act would come into effect from a much earlier period than the actual date of its introduction in the Legislature. The Hon. Chief Minister rightly thought then that retrospective effect should be given to that Act in order to counteract any possible mischief to violate the provisions of that Act. Similarly, in the case of the Malabar Tenancy Bill, retrospective effect was given, I think, from the year 1945. They have put the clock back to 1945. What I wish to stress is there must be equity and the poor peasants who might have been evicted in the year 1946 and thereafter should also be given some relief. In the case of the Malabar Tenancy Bill, there was some agitation for giving relief to the poor peasants by giving retrospective effect to the provisions of that Act. It is agreed on all hands that the present Bill under discussion is intended to afford adequate relief to the poor suffering peasants and it is but fair that we must give retrospective effect to the Bill. Therefore I submit that since 1946 there has been eviction and the equity must start in future from that period, namely, 1946. Therefore I submit to this House that the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, is a modest one. It is not only modest, it is just one because he has mentioned in his amendment that wherever new tenants have been brought into the land there may not be equity in evicting the new tenants and third party rights might be interfered with. He has only suggested that if new persons have not come in, where the original sinner, if I may use that term with considerable deference, if that person continues to be in possession the land should be disgorged in his favour. The only argument that could stand in the way of this amendment being accepted is, support for those persons who I dare say must be big landlords. There is no need to be so very soft about these persons and when new tenants have not come in, it is just and desirable and also in the interests of the furtherance of the objectives of this Bill, to accept this amendment.

I only wish to say a word more. Let us not have suspicion and mistrust. Let not everything coming from one side be condemned as based on political motives. Let us not also recriminate

27th November 1952] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

the other side if there is refusal to accept a particular amendment. There is no political motive on either side. This is purely a measure seeking to improve the relationship between the landlord and the tenants. This is purely an economic question. This is a matter concerning food production and agriculture. Let us view it from the economic plane and give full effect to the objective of the Bill. I humbly believe that if Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment is accepted, it will fully bring into effect the real objectives of the Bill, namely, to benefit the tenants who have been unreasonably evicted."

SRI S. VADIVELU :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்து சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

"பெரும்பாலும் 1946-47-ம் வருடத்தில்தான் நியாயக் கூலிக்காக தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகள் போராடினார்கள். அதன் காரணமாக அடக்கு முறையைக் கைமாண்டு மிராசுதார்கள் பெரும்பாலான விவசாயிகளையும் வாரதாரர்களையும் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றினார்கள். ஆனால், இந்தச் சட்டத்தில், 1946-47-ம் வருடத்திலே நீக்கப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு மீண்டும் அந்த நிலத்தைத் திருப்பித் தரவேண்டுமென்று நண்பர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிற திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இன்னொரு விஷயத்தையும் சர்க்காருடைய ஞாபகத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

"பெரும்பாலும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு இரண்டு விதமான கூலிகள் வழங்கப் பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஒரு வேலிக்குட்பட்ட மிராசுதார்களை இந்தச் சட்டம் கட்டுப் படுத்தாது என்று நேற்று இந்தச் சபையில் தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றப் பட்டது. அதனால் ஒரு கிராமத்திலே பல விவசாயிகளுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரம் பாதிக்கப்படும் என்று இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

"ஒரு கிராமத்தில் 100 சிறு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களும், 10 பெரிய நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களும் இருந்தால், 10 மிராசுதார்கள் இந்தச் சட்டப்படி கூலி கொடுத்தால் பாக்ஷ் இருக்கக்கூடிய 100 சிறிய மிராசுதார்கள் அதே கூலியைக் கொடுக்கமாட்டார்கள் என்பதை நான் ஞாபகமூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக கூலி எவ்வளவு வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வந்தார்களோ அந்தக் கூலிகூட இன்றைக்கு கிடைக்க முடியாத நிலையில் இருக்கிறது.

"அடுத்தபடியாக விவசாயிகளுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டப்படி குடியிருப்புக்கு மனைக்கட்டு சொந்தமாகப்படவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். 1946-47-ம் வருடத்திலே நீக்கப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு மீண்டும் நிலம் அவர்களுக்கு கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்."

* **SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR** :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi. If from 1946 no new tenant has been brought in on the land, it can only mean that the land ought to be in the actual occupation of the landlord. Such things happen only in the case of small landlords. Here our aim is chiefly to discourage absentee landlordism. When the small landlord is inclined to cultivate the land himself and profit by personal cultivation, he should not be prevented from doing so. If there are cases where new tenants have not been brought in on the land from the year 1946, it should be that the land is not left waste but that the lands are under the personal cultivation of the landlords themselves.

[Sri P. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar] [27th November 1952]

"Their rights should not in any way be affected by a person who was evicted from the land long long ago. Such small landlords will be affected if this amendment were to be accepted. I therefore oppose the amendment."

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, எனக்கு முன்பு பேசிய சர்க்கார் கட்டி அங்கத்தினர், ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை எதிர்க்கும்போது, இந்தத் திருத்தம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளப்பட்டால் தாங்களே சாகுபடி செய்யக்கூடிய சிறு நிலச் சவாந்தார்கள் இதனால் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள் என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால் நிலைமை அப்படியில்ல தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில், 1946-வது வருஷத்திலிருந்து அங்கு நடந்த விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே ஒழிக்கவேண்டுமென்று திட்டமிட்டு பெரு நிலச் சவாந்தார்கள் அவர்களிடம் சாகுபடி செய்த விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். வெளியேற்றுவது மட்டுமல்ல. அவர்கள் முன் கூட்டியே திட்டமிட்டு வேறு விவசாயிகளுக்கு குத்தகைக்கோ வாரத்திற்கோ கொடுக்காமல் அவர்களே கூலி ஆட்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு சொந்தமாகச் சாகுபடி செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் சிறு நிலச் சவாந்தார்கள் அல்ல. பெரு நிலச் சவாந்தார்கள்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஏனென்றால் இந்த விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே ஒழிக்கவேண்டும், மீண்டும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இம்மாதிரி விவசாயிகள் இயக்கங்கள் ஏற்படக்கூடாது என்ற நோக்கத்தோடு வெளியேற்றங்கள் நடைபெறுகின்றன.

“ நலங்களில் ருந்து விவசாயிகள் வெளியேற்றப்படுவதோடு மட்டுமல்ல. ஏற்கனவே அவர்களிடம் பரம்பரை பரம்பரைபாக தொன்றுதொட்டு வேலை செய்துவந்த பண்ணையாட்களை வேலையிலிருந்து நக்கிவிட்டு இன்றைக்கு சாகுபடி செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட நோக்கம், கனம் பிரதமர் மந்திரி அவர்கள் முன் தினம் சொல்லியது போல், விவசாயிகளுக்கும், விவசாயக் கூலிகளுக்கும் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க வேண்டுமானால், அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலச் சவாந்தார்களும், விவசாயிகளும், விவசாயக் கூலியாட்களும் அந்நியோன்யமாகப் பழகவேண்டுமென்று முன் தினம் மிகத் தெளிவாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அதை ஒத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமானால், அம்மாதிரி நடைமுறையில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நடைபெறவேண்டுமானால் 1946-லிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளையும் அம்மாதிரி வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட விவசாயக் கூலிகளையும் பண்ணையாட்களையும் திரும்ப எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று சட்டத்தில் இருந்தால்தான் எந்த நோக்கத்திற்காக இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப் பட்டதாகக் சொல்லப்படுகிறதோ அந்த நோக்கம் ஓரளவு நிறைவேற்றப்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய தாழ்மையான அபிப்பிராயம்.

“ 1946-லிருந்து யாருக்கும் வாங்குத்தகை மாற்றிக் கொடுக்காமல் அவர்களே வைத்துக்கொண்டு இருக்கக்கூடிய பெரு நிலச் சவாந்தார்கள் இந்த ஏழைகளுக்கு, இன்றைக்கு வேறு நிலம் கிடைக்காமல், கூலி வேலை கிடைக்காமல், கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டும், சாப்பாட்டுக்குக்கூட வழியில்லாமல் அவஸ்தைப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற விவசாயிகளுக்கு நிலம் திருப்பிக் கொடுத்து, அவர்கள் நல்லாற்பு வாழ்வதற்கு வகை செய்வதற்கு எந்த வித ஆட்சேபனையும் காங்கிரஸ் அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கோ சர்க்காருக்கோ இருக்கமுடியாது என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை சர்க்கார் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Ayyar took away the sting from Mr. Ramamurthi's presentation of the demand. Mr. Ramamurthi at every stage seemed to think that whatever amendment was proposed which he considered to be important, to that should be tacked a statement that if it was not accepted, the motives of the Government were proved to be wrong, that they

27th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

intended to suppress the peasant movement or support the land-owners. I submit that that way of presentation, to say the least, does not appeal to me. I may even go further and say that it rather prejudices my mind unnecessarily. I wish to fight against the prejudice and present only the justification for the Government not accepting the amendment. Now the provision as proposed in the original sub-clause (2) takes us back two and a half years from now, that is, roughly $2\frac{1}{2}$ years before the Ordinance. Whoever was then in possession will be restored to possession more or less.

"If there was any new tenant in possession of the land he has got every right to enjoy what he had laboured for to raise the crop. But Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment asks us to go back six years. He wants that we should go back six years and reinstate those cultivating tenants who had been deprived of their possession so long ago. Let us remember the time limit imposed in Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment. It is six years. He says somebody who had no right in the land according to law, but who was cultivating the land six years ago should now be called and given occupancy rights in preference to those tenants who had been working on the land subsequently all these two and a half years. To give legal rights to the cultivator working six years ago, of whom we do not have any records or any authoritative document, is almost an impracticable task. To determine whether those tenants had been cultivating tenants or casual labourers before six years would mean taking upon ourselves such stupendous administrative difficulties which are well nigh impossible to be performed properly.

12-30
p.m.

"Apart from this difficulty, let us see what the amendment says with regard to existing tenants who are now working in the lands. If we were to accept the amendment, it virtually amounts to calling back those cultivating tenants or pannaiyals (it does not matter to which category they belong) and give them legal rights over the land *now* and at the same time *dispossess* those cultivating tenants who had produced paddy all these two and a half years. This would amount to a great disturbance among the people who are now working. Let us remember that all these years from 1946 up to now the land had been under cultivation, food was produced, paddy was grown and the land was under continuous supervision. Merely for the sake of politics or for creating a new political agitation, it is unfair to eject all these people who had been working on the land all these six years and reinstate in their place men who were working before them. This would be highly unjust and improper. In every case where we make an amendment of this nature, disturbances are bound to occur. We should of course see that disturbances do not mount too much. At the time of the drafting the Ordinance, Government paid careful consideration to this question and came to the conclusion that the two and a half years period was an equitable one. More than that, hon. Members should know that the agricultural year for 1950-51 would begin in May 1950. Let us not go farther back than this period. The present fixation of the period of two and a half years

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

would create no undue hardship to the tenants. If cultivation has proceeded rightly or wrongly all these two and a half years, there won't be any difficulty involved either way to the tenants by the provision under this clause fixing the period of two and a half years. If on the other hand, as I had already stated, we were to ask the tenants who had been growing paddy all these years right from 1946 up till now to get out and were to insert an amendment bringing back the tenants prior to 1946, it would be very unfair. Apart from the difficulties involved, it would be unjust to evict the present tenants. These are the reasons, Sir, why the Government are unable to accept the pushing back of the date beyond two and a half years."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Chief Minister has put forward the excuse that if he were to accept my amendment it would mean a lot of administrative difficulties. He admits that in the case of those people who have been evicted two and a half years ago, it is quite a proper thing for their case being considered sympathetically. According to the Hon. Chief Minister, those tenants are perfectly justified in being reinstated. The case of thousands of tenants dispossessed long before, i.e., six years ago and who are now helpless, does not appeal to our Hon. Chief Minister.

" What is it that my amendment exactly seeks to bring about? I want that those poor tenants who number in thousands and who had been evicted six years ago should now be given legal rights over their lands. The plea has been put forward by the Hon. Chief Minister that the lands are now being cultivated by other persons and that they should not be disturbed. I know practically in several of the villages in Tanjore the mirasdars have not engaged other regular tenants. They have been engaging their own pannaiyals or casual labourers. These mirasdars are thus no longer employing any new tenants in the place of the old men and so are not in duty bound to give the tenants an equitable share in the produce."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I do not wish to be too long. I tried to be as brief as possible. But my friend Mr. Ramamurthi who is dealing with this amendment at great length should remember that the lands he is referring to have been under cultivation all these years and people have been working there. The question is, why should we disturb the present workers who are cultivating the fields? "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Chief Minister pleads that those people evicted before the agricultural year 1950-51 are entitled to being reinstated. Their number may be comparatively few. I want to ask what justice had been done to thousands of tenants evicted six years before and who are at present helpless? "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The rule of quantity should be applied, Sir. We can tolerate ten people but when it comes to thousands, it becomes intolerable."

27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Therefore, the Hon. Chief Minister had explained that this is a question of toleration and not one pertaining to justice.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Toleration of nuisance, Sir.”

* **SRI P. RAMAMURTHI** :—“ Let it be toleration of nuisance. It is bound to be nuisance whether we like it or not, for it is a problem involving poor tenants. These poor tenants evicted six years ago deserve our immediate attention. Justice should be done to them. They had been in possession of the lands not for some years but for generations. I know thousands of such cases. What has happened since then? In several villages, I do not want to give the names, the old tenants had been evicted and in their stead the mirasdars have employed casual labourers whom they pay according to their likes. These casual labourers get wages for the days they work. They are not to work there all through the year. What was the case with reference to the old tenants? They had been cultivating those lands for several generations, from time immemorial. Suddenly they had been evicted. From 1946, they have lost proprietary rights over the lands. The casual labourers had taken their place. Therefore, we see that this is not a question of disturbing the existing tenants, as pointed out by the Hon. Chief Minister. This question does not involve any exproprietary right. We only want that justice should be done to those tenants evicted from their holdings which they had been enjoying from time immemorial. This is what we ask. A very simple and modest request that those tenants evicted six years ago, i.e., before 1946, should now be reinstated in their original places. I think nobody can deny that this is a very modest request which could be easily complied with.

“ I shall come to what is termed by the Hon. the Chief Minister as ‘ attributing motives to the Government ’. It has been the practice of the Hon. Chief Minister to attribute motives to us in every one of his utterances. Whatever we say (I mean the Communists) carries with it some sting. This is how the Hon. Chief Minister looks at us. Whenever we represent the grievances of the people, according to the Hon. the Chief Minister, we are ‘ attributing motives to the Government ’. When for every word we say the Hon. the Chief Minister himself is attributing a ‘ motive ’, we on this side of the House are also entitled to retaliate. The Hon. the Chief Minister has just now told us that he gets at times ‘ prejudiced ’ with our remarks and he is fighting to get rid of that prejudice and trying to take a dispassionate view of things. I am glad that the Hon. the Chief Minister is trying to take a dispassionate view. Let him root out the prejudice completely from his mind and examine this present question on the merits of the case. Let him realize that thousands of lives are involved here. Let him therefore look at this problem with a clear and dispassionate view. Let justice be meted out to those who deserve.”

* **THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER** :— 12-40
“ Sir, the hon. Member wants to put back the clock from 1st P.m.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

[27th November 1952]

December 1951 to 1st December 1946. He also asked while we could adjust for a period of 2½ years why we could not adjust for a period of six years. If we accept the amendment, some other amendments may come putting back the date to 1st December 1940 or 1937. There must be some point from which we could start. 1st December 1951 was fixed because it was the date on which the Land Revenue Reforms Committee Report was published and it might be that some tenants were evicted in anticipation of the publication of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee Report. If any tenants were evicted after 1st December 1951, they must be reinstated according to this Bill. The argument of the hon. Member looks like finding out the heart and lungs of a man who died by exhuming it now. Five or six years ago, it is not practicable. I therefore oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (2), add the following proviso :—

" Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the conciliation officer to be restored to such possession."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah has given notice of the following amendment :—

' In sub-clause (2) for the words " five years ", substitute the words " ten years ".

As I already said yesterday, he cannot move the amendment."

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, "అంబి క్లాజులో ఉన్న రెడవ టెక్సును చివర sub-clause (2-A) గా ఉండి ఖాగాన్ని చేర్చాలని నేను సవరణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A) :—

" The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district."

ఒక precautionary measure గా ఉండటం కోసం నేను ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించాలని కోరుకుంటున్నాను. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో Ordinance ప్రవేశ పెట్టగానే రాష్ట్రపతి కౌలుదార్లకు జరుగుతున్న అన్యాయాన్ని విచారించడానికి యీ సవరణ అవసరమవుతున్నది. ఇప్పటికప్పుడే అనేక జిల్లాలలో భూస్వాములు కౌలుదార్లను భూముల నుండి తొలగించి వేశారు. ఇలా పెద్దపట్టున కౌలుదార్లను తొలగిస్తున్న సంగతి ప్రభుత్వానికి నూతనంగా తెలుసును. కౌలుదార్లను తొలగించకుండా, తొలగించినా కౌలుదార్లకు నష్టము వాటిల్లకుండా చేయడానికి యీ సవరణ precautionary measure గా ఉపయోగపడుతుంది. మన ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు యీ నిట్టము

27th November 1952] [Sri K. Rajagopala Rao]

యివ్వాలి కాకపోతే రేపా, రేపు కాకపోతే ఎల్లప్పుడూ రాష్ట్రానికింతకు వరించుకుంటున్నారు ప్రభుత్వం రాష్ట్రానికింతకు యీ చట్టం వర్తింపజేసేనాటికి కౌలుదార్ల క్రిందవున్న భూములపని పని భూస్వాములు పూర్తిగా స్వాధీనము చేసుకుంటారని, కౌలుదారనే వాడే రాష్ట్రములో లేకుండా పోతాడేమో నని అనుమానం. అందువల్ల రాష్ట్రంలో వ్యవసాయంపై జీవించే ఒకలాది కౌలుదార్ల పీఠి వారిత క్లిష్టము, దుర్భరము అవుతుంది. ఇప్పటికీ చాలా జిల్లాలలో తొలగించబడిన కౌలుదార్లు నిరాధారై వున్నారు. జీవోపాధికి వెళ్ళే మార్గంలో ఆల్టామెంట్లున్నారు. అందుకని యీ సవరణ అవసరమని, యిదికా precautionary measure గా చేర్చును నేను కోరుతున్నాను. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము రాష్ట్రములోని వాస్తవిక పరిస్థితుల్ని, కౌలుదార్లలో విర్వడిన అలక్షణని, కౌలుదార్లను అక్రమంగా తొలగిస్తే దేశమువల్ల విర్వడుతున్న సంస్కరణాన్ని, వృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని భూమిని పాగుచేసుకుంటున్న రైతుకు తగిన రక్షణయివ్వాలి. దీనికూడా ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించకపోతే, మరి కౌలుదార్లకు చేయగలిగిన సహాయమేమిటో బోధపడటంలేదు. కాబట్టి సభవారు యీ విషయాన్ని బాగ్గుతగా పరిశీలించి యీ సవరణయొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశాన్ని గుర్తించి, పేదరైతులకు కౌలుదార్లకు సహాయము చేయడానికే, భూముల నుంచి తొలగించబడుతున్న కౌలుదార్లకు సేద్యంచేసుకునే ఆధికారం సంక్రమింపచేయడానికీ, యీ సవరణను ఆమోదించవలసిందిగా కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri K. Rajagopala Rao.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A) :—

“ The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district.” ’

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, the hon. Member is thinking too far ahead of the provisions of this Bill when he refers to extension, etc. I therefore oppose the amendment.”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ నా సవరణకు రెవిన్యూ కమిషనరీచ్చిన జవాబు సంప్రక్షింపకం లేదు. కౌలుదార్ల తొలగింపును ఆరెకట్టుడానికి ఒక precautionary measure గా యీ సవరణను ఆమోదించడంలో ప్రభుత్వానికిన్న అభ్యంతరాలేమిటో వారు వివరించ నే లేదు. అందుకని సభవారు నా సవరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A) :—

“ The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district.” ’

The amendment was lost.

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name :—

‘ In sub-clause (3), for the word “ commencement ”, substitute the word “ passing ”. ’

Sir, the present sub-clause (3) says, ‘ Every application to a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be made within thirty days from the commencement of this Act, and shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee ’. Instead of that, by my amendment, it reads, ‘ Every application to a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be made within thirty days from the passing of this Act, and shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee ’. This Act comes into force from the 23rd August 1952, i.e., from three or four months before. At the time the Ordinance was passed, it was laid down that within one month from the date of passing of the Ordinance, the tenants who had been evicted should claim possession of the land before the Conciliation Officer. We feel that, for a law of this type, one month’s time is too short a period. It is only with a view to enable those people who could not possibly have put in their applications within one month from the date of the Ordinance, to put in their claims within one month from the passing of this Act, i.e., from the date the assent of the President is received, that this amendment is suggested. As a matter of fact, when we approached the Conciliation Officers, it was found that they did not get instructions as to what they had to do and that forms were not available, etc. I know that, as a result of representations made in the Select Committee, certain new provisions have been adopted, viz.—

‘ Provided that the application may be received after the period of thirty days aforesaid, if the applicant satisfies the Conciliation Officer that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within that period. ’

Explanation.—The rejection of an application before the passing of this Act on the ground of its not having been presented in time shall not prevent the receipt of an application under the foregoing proviso after the passing of this Act. ’

Therefore, if there are cases of peasants whose applications were not entertained on the ground that they were not presented within thirty days from the commencement of this Act, it certainly gives power to the Conciliation Officer to entertain them. Even though applications might have been rejected on that ground, the Conciliation Officer can re-entertain them if there are sufficient grounds for not making the applications within that period. What does this mean? It means that each Conciliation Officer without any criterion whatsoever, according to his own discretion, can decide whether a particular application which had been rejected before on the particular ground I mentioned above, should be re-entertained or not. The whole question is left to the individual discretion of so many Conciliation Officers that may be appointed throughout the district and the peasants are made to depend upon the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officers. In order to obviate the necessity of the peasants depending upon the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officers, I moved the amendment

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

to change the words 'from the commencement of this Act' to 'from the passing of this Act', i.e., from the date of receipt of the assent of the President. This is my simple request and I request the Government to accept it."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—"Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Mr. P. Ramamurthi."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

'In sub-clause (3), for the word "commencement", substitute the word "passing".'

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I should like to make one matter clear. Between the Hon. Chief Minister and the Opposition, on the subject-matter of this provision, there was no difference of opinion. In fact, the Hon. Chief Minister agreed to extend the time for putting in these applications. The Ordinance is already now in force, and therefore, if the original time given in the Ordinance is not sufficient, in view of the Act, the Hon. Chief Minister was pleased to say that he would issue another notification extending the time, so that the period not covered by this Act may still be covered by the notification under the Ordinance. The only fear is whether the present provision in the Bill carries that into effect; if we say from the 'commencement' of the Act. If we say 'from the passing of this Act', the period between the date of the Ordinance and the date of passing of this Act will be covered, and there will be no fear about it. And that is the reason for moving this amendment, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I am afraid the Leader of the Opposition has not understood Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment. The Leader of the Opposition and I and all the Members of the Committee agreed that the present provision here as it stands covers all the cases which the Leader of the Opposition has in mind, as he explained just now. But Mr. Ramamurthi wants to go further. He says that not only should there be an opportunity for those who did not apply, to apply again and not only should there be discretion left to the Conciliation Officer to find out whether there was sufficient cause for not applying within the limited time or up till now—he might have good cause for not applying even till to-day—but he says 'leave no discretion to the Conciliation Officer, and allow anyone to apply within thirty days after the Act is passed—i.e., in December or January next'. Therefore, it is not as if Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment arises out of any doubt in the language of the provision in the Bill; he wants to extend the provision to those who deliberately remained without applying so far, so that they may apply hereafter. It is a substantially large amendment which he wants and it would be altogether impossible to consider or even dispose of properly. Here is a case where people had to apply within thirty days. Supposing by some magic the Ordinance had been complete law by itself. All those who had to apply must

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[27th November 1952]

have applied under the Ordinance. If out of ignorance of the law or for any other reason they did not apply, they can easily satisfy the Conciliation Officer that they could not apply till now. So, Sir, the amendment cannot be accepted, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I have already explained, on merits, why it cannot be accepted."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, the only reason the Chief Minister adduced against the acceptance of this amendment is that it will throw the door open for a large number of applicants now. I would like first of all to disabuse the mind of the Chief Minister of any fear that litigation will increase; at any rate, litigation is not something which is liked by this class of people. It may be that the peasants who have already got lands and money may go in for the courts; but as far as these people are concerned, they cannot afford the luxury of going to the courts. It is only people who were genuinely thrown out of the land, people who might have a claim but who did not previously understand what this Ordinance is, that could put in such applications. I am sure it will not throw the door open to false claims; I may assure the Chief Minister of that, because, as I said, these people will not obviously think of resorting to litigation. My main objection is: you are leaving it to the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officer. What is the criterion, I want to know? Are you laying down, for instance, that the Conciliation Officer should entertain all these cases on certain grounds? It is all a question of his own personal satisfaction; and the satisfaction of various individual Conciliation Officers whose minds may differ on the question of re-entertainment, is not easy. I say that in all fairness, you cannot leave it to the Conciliation Officer's individual discretion. I submit this is a very reasonable amendment, and I therefore press it."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, the object the hon. Member has in view is covered both by the proviso and the Explanation under this sub-clause. I think there is a slight misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Member in assessing the implication of the amendment. He says that the Conciliation Officer works as an ordinary man. I submit it is not as an ordinary man that he works; he will work as a judicial man. He exercises his judicial mind and all reasonable cases under the Act would be covered. Cases that are likely not to be covered by these provisions can naturally be only frivolous cases. I therefore oppose the amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that Conciliation Officers are certainly not judicial people; they are only Tahsildars."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" But they will apply a judicial mind to these cases."

27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The amendment is—

'In sub-clause (3), for the word "commencement", substitute the word "passing".'"

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri D. Seetharamiah has given notice of two amendments. He may move both the amendments together."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లియొక్క అరవ కాన్జులో మూడవ సబ్-క్లాజు విషయమై రెండు amendments యిచ్చాను. యీ బిల్లిలో ఘాన్యాములకు, రైతులకు, పన్నెయాలలకు, కౌలుదార్లకు జరిగే తగాదాల విషయములూ Conciliation Officers కు complaints ముప్పది రోజులలోగా ఇవ్వాలని ఉంది. యీ గడువు 30 దినములు చాలదని నా అభిప్రాయము. యీ కొలది కాలములో రైతులు, కౌలుదార్లు వగైరాలకు, యాక్టులోని legal implications తెలియని కారణము చేతను, చదువురానివారు అయినందునను, వాళ్లకు యీ యాక్టు, దానియొక్క విషయములు అందుబాటులో ఉండవని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో వారికి ముప్పది దినములు మాత్రమే ప్రముఖులై తమ హక్కును రుజువు చేసుకోవలసివస్తుంది. అందులో 23 వ ఆగస్టునుండి మాత్రమే ప్రముఖులై వచ్చునారు ఈ నెలరోజులలో వారు తగాదాలు అన్ని కూడా కన్సైమియేషన్ ఆఫీసుకు అందజేయాలని యీ బిల్లిలో చూపబడింది. ఇది రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయము కలుగజేస్తుందని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను. అందువల్ల ఈ ముప్పది రోజులకు బదులుగా తొందరై రోజులు పెట్టాలనిస్తే, యిది సరియైన పద్ధతి అనిస్తే నేను కోరుతున్నాను. యీ రైతులు, పన్నెయాలలు చదువురానివారు అయినందున, వీరు ఈ complaints ను Conciliation Officers కు అందజేయుటకునూ, అవి నిర్వహించుకొనుటకును యీ సవరణ ద్వారా తగిన సౌకర్యము యిచ్చుటకు వీలుఅగును. అందువలన తొందరై రోజులు గడువును పెట్టుచు నేను నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించుచున్నాను.

"అంతేకాకుండా, మరొక సవరణ యిచ్చియున్నాను. యీ బిల్లిలో ప్రతి రైతుగాని, పన్నెయాలగాని, తమ కంప్లెయింటుకు ఒక రూపాయ కోర్టుఫీజు లెక్క అంటించవలెనని యున్నది. యీ బిల్లియొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతులను రక్షించుటకు తెచ్చామని చెప్పమో, వారు Court-fee stamp కుగాను ఒక రూపాయ లెక్క తమ పిటిషన్సుకు రైతులు అంటించవలెనని చెప్పబడియున్నది. వేద ప్రజానీకమైన యీ రైతులకు యిటువంటి ఖర్చు పెట్టుట చాలా అన్యాయము. రైతుల పరిస్థితి యేమిటి? ఎక్కో సవరణలగుగా రైతులు, పన్నెయాలలు ఘాన్యాముల దోపిడికి గురియై కాటక దర్శిద్రావణతో కుమిలిపోతున్నారు. అట్టివారినుండి కూడా కోర్టుఫీజు వసూలుచేయడం సబబుకాదు. డబ్బుగల ఘాన్యాములు ఎంత ఖర్చు అయిన ధరించగలరు. వారిని ఒక రూపాయకాదు పది రూపాయలు ఫీజు కట్టువనండి. కాగా వుంటుంది. కాని యీ వేద రైతులు యీ ఖర్చును ఎట్లు ధరించగలరు? Court-fee stamp కు గాను డబ్బులేని పక్షములో, వారు ఎట్లా తమ కంప్లెయింటు న్నొందుకోగలరని అడుగుచున్నాను. యీ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారు గుర్తించాలి. అందువలన, యీ వేదరైతులకునూ మాత్రము యీ stamp fees నుండి మినహాయించే అవకాశము యివ్వాలని యీనాడు నేను సవరణ తెచ్చాను. అట్లు చేయనిచేతల కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమువారికి అన్యాయమే చేయదలచారని చెప్పకతప్పదు. ధన

[Sri D. Seetharamiah] [27th November 1952]

పంతులైన భూస్వాములపై నిరుపేద రైతులపై సరిసమానముగా యీ కీజు వేయడం
న్యాయంకాదు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారిని నా సవరింపు ఆమోదించమని కోరు
తున్నాను.

1 p.m. ' (i) in sub-clause (3), omit the words "shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee" occurring after the words "commencement of this Act."

(ii) in the proviso in sub-clause (3), for the word "thirty" substitute the word "ninety".

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్ష, నేను D. సీతారామయ్య గారి సవరణను బలపరచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఒక రూపాయి గోడ్డు ఫీస్టాంపు వేయబడ్డది tenants కు, pannaiyals కు చాలా అన్యాయంగా ఉంటుంది. మొదలే, ఉద్యోగము లేకుండా భూమిమంచి తొలగించబడి ఉన్నప్పుడు, Conciliation Officer కు application పెట్టుకొనవలసినటువంటి సందర్భములో వానికి ఒక రూపాయి గోడ్డు ఫీజు స్టాంపు పెట్టవలసినదే, అందుకు డబ్బు లేక చాలామంది ఆ application కూడ పెట్టుకోలేని స్థితిలో ఉంటున్నారు. అందుకని దీనిని తొలగించవలసిన అవసరంతో ఈ సవరణను బలపరచున్నాను. దీనిని తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించవలసినది నేను కోరుతున్నాను.

“తరువాత ఇటువంటి applications పెట్టుకొనుటకు మూడు మాసములు గడువు ఉండాలని నీతిరామయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన రెండవ సవరణనూడా చాలా స్వయంగా యిచ్చింది. ఇంతకు ముందు రామమూర్తిగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించినప్పుడు కనీసము ఈ 90 రోజుల గడువు పాడుగొప్పైన అంగీకరించడం భావ్యము. కాబట్టి దీనిని తప్పని సరిగా ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించాలని నేను కోరుతున్నాను.”

*SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கும் முறையில், மனுப்போட்டுக் கொண்டால் கோர்ட்டீஸ் ஸ்டாம்பு ஒரு ரூபாய்க்கு ஓட்ட வேண்டும் என்று சட்டத்தில் இருக்கிறது. அது அவ்வளவு முக்கியமில்லை என்பதைச் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். சாதாரணமாக சாகுபடிக்காரர்கள் ஜாதி ஹிந்துக்களாகவும் ஆதி திராவிடர்களாகவுந்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஏற்கனவே அவர்கள் சாகுபடி செய்யப்படாமல் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றப்பட்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி வெளியேற்றப்பட்டு இருப்பதால் அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய சரப்பாட்டிற்கே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் அதிகமான சிரமத்தில் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பண்ணையாட்கள் தங்களை திரும்பி வேலைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று மனுக் கொடுக்க ஸ்டாம்பு வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்களே. அதைப்போலவே சாகுபடியாளர்களும் நிலங்களை தங்களுக்குத் திருப்பித் தர வேண்டுமென்று மனுப்போட ஒரு ரூபாய் ஸ்டாம்பு ஓட்டவேண்டும் என்ற நிர்ப்பந்தம் இருப்பதை எடுத்துவிட வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதையும் சர்க்கார் ஒத்துக் கொள்ளுவார்கள் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன்.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know why hon. Members wish that no court-fee stamps should be required. It is based upon the principle on which court-fee stamps are generally required on applications and petitions. Further, I know many cases where villagers who, even in cases where no court-fee stamps are required,

27th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

insist upon a court-fee stamp being affixed because they feel that only if a court-fee stamp is affixed their case will be properly looked into. Apart from that, it follows the general principle of requiring court-fee for petitions.

"With regard to the second amendment, I wish to remind the hon. Member that it will have the effect of defeating the very object he has in view. According to the provision as reported upon by the Select Committee, there is more time than that allowed originally for putting in the applications and the hon. Member wants to restrict the period. Further the amendment would be infructuous because the period of ninety days would have already lapsed. Therefore, I oppose the amendments."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అదృష్ట రైతులంతా court-fee stamp ఉండాలనే కోరుతున్నారని మంత్రిగారు నెలవిచ్చారు. మంత్రిగారి భావములూ రైతులు అంతే ఎవరో నాకు అర్థం కావడంలేదు. వారి భావములూ ఉన్నట్టువంటి రైతులు వేరు. స్వతహా నేషన్లకు చేస్తూ 24 గంటలు ఖామిపైనే కట్టవలెనా ఉండేటటువంటి రైతు రెవరూ కూడ అవిధంగా కోరడం లేదు. వారివద్ద పైకంకూడా లేదు. పైకమనేది లేనప్పుడు స్టాంపుద్వారా వేస్తామని (stamp) వారు అంటున్నారని మంత్రిగారు నెలవిస్తున్నారంటే అది వా సరికొరకైనది విరుద్ధమైనట్టువంటిది. అంతేకాకుండా అప్లికేషను (application) పెట్టుకోవడానికి 30 రోజులే గడువు ఉన్నారంటే ఈ బిల్లియొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యమే పోయిందని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ గడువును 90 దినాలకు పొడిగించితేనే రైతులకు సరియైనట్టువంటి న్యాయము కలుగుతుంది రైతులు చదువురాని వారు. వారి గ్రామాలకు మనం చేస్తున్న చట్టాలు చేరే మార్గాలు లేవు. అంటున్నప్పుడు 90 రోజులు గడువు యిస్తేనే గానీ, వారు తమ హక్కులను కాపాడుకోలేరు. గనుక ప్రభుత్వము వారు యీ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“Let me make it clear to the House that I am going to put both the amendments to the vote of the House. I will read the amendments. The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (3), omit the words “shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee” occurring after the words “commencement of this Act”.

(ii) In the proviso in sub-clause (3), for the word “thirty” substitute the word “ninety”.

The amendments were lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a printer's devil in the amendment that I gave notice of and it has been circulated to the House like that. I, therefore, move—

In sub-clause (4), omit the condition (i) and re-number condition (ii) as condition (i).’

My amendment, Sir, relates to the payment of arrears of rent. The arrears of rent have accrued because the tenants were not able to pay but under this provision, to be restored to the occupation of their lands, they have to pay arrears. I submit that this is a very reasonable amendment because the tenants had not

[Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan]

[27th November 1952]

been in a position to pay and to ask them to pay now would be difficult. I submit that it is reasonable that the Government should cancel arrears of rent and I request the House to accept the amendment."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment. Unless the tenant pays the arrears of rent, he cannot regain possession of the land. That will amount as a matter of fact to imposing a condition upon the tenant for his being restored to the right of tilling the land. If the land-owner has got any claim for the arrears of rent, there is always, according to the Chief Minister's intention, resort to courts. There are the courts in which he can file a suit. I submit that when once the claim of the tenant is to be decided by the Conciliation Officer, this matter should not be taken into account because the Conciliation Officer is not a judicial officer and there is every danger of his arbitrarily deciding these things. Most land-owners will put up the plea that the tenants owe them money and many false allegations will be made. As such, this clause should be omitted."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a subterfugeous amendment. This will defeat the very object with which those clauses have been put in and so, I cannot find my way to accept the amendment."

1-10
p.m.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" I do not understand what the Hon. Minister means by saying 'subterfuge'. I have given notice of another amendment in respect of sub-clause (6) of clause 6 which will fit in with this amendment and it is quite suitable. Therefore, I am not withdrawing my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (4), omit the condition (i) and re-number the condition (ii) as condition (i).'"

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" Sir, I move—

'In sub-clause (6), for the words "so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent", substitute the words "so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded".'

This is a corollary to my previous amendment I moved in respect of sub-clause (4) of clause 6. There is no need for me to explain my amendment."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

'In sub-clause (6), for the words "so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent", substitute the words "so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded".'

27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I have nothing more to add to what I have already said."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (6), for the words " so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent ", substitute the words " so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded " ' "

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" I move—

' Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6). '

Sir, tenants are forced to pay arrears of rent and it is only just that they are refunded if already collected. That is the object of my amendment."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6). ' "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6). ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Clause 6 as amended do stand part of the Bill. ' "

The motion was carried.

Clause 7.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the amendment that stands in my name—

' Omit sub-clause (a) and re-letter the other sub-clauses. ' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" If this amendment is lost, then Mr. Ramamurthi cannot move his amendment, as it is on the same lines as the present one."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" In the Joint Select Committee some hon. Members including myself and Mr. Viswanatham wanted that the Government should not encroach upon the freedom and the right of cultivating tenant to grow whatever crops he likes. The expression ' cultivating tenant ' ordinarily means in Telugu ' kapu '. ' Kapu ' means producer. Therefore it is natural and highly necessary that the producer should have the right to determine which crop he has to raise on the land. The landlord who is at a far distance cannot have and should not have the right to determine the crops that should be raised. It is the cultivator who knows what crop he

[Sri P. Pundarikakshacharyulu] [27th November 1952]

has to raise according to the seasonal conditions and raises the suitable crop at the right time. Therefore I humbly request the Government to accept my amendment."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఇది చాలా ప్రధాన మైలుపంట క్లాజు, ఏ పంటను, ఏ పొలములో ఎంత వేయాలి అని ఎవరు నిర్ణయించాలి అనేటటు సమస్య ఉన్నది. ఎవరైతే పొలాన్ని గుత్తకుగాని, కాలుకుగాని తీసుకొంటారో, వారే ఫలానా పంట వేయాలి అని నిర్ణయించుట చాలా ప్రధాన మైలుపంట విషయము. ఒక ఖాస్సామికి ఒక సూరో లేక మున్నూరు ఎకరాలలో ఉంటే, ఆ ఖాస్సామి తనకు కావలసినటువంటి వివిధ రకాల పంటను వివిధ tenants చే పండించుటకు ప్రయత్నము చేస్తాడు. ఈ ప్రయత్నములో ఇది tenants కు లాభకరముకాదా అనేటటువంటి విషయము ఆ ఖాస్సామి ఆలోచించడు. తనకు ఎప్పుడు కావలసినట్లే కొంత మంది tenants ను కొంత భాగము పొలములో వరి పంట వేయమని చెప్పతాడు. తనకు వేరుతగగ కావలసియుంటే, అది పండించడానికి, మరి కొంత మంది tenants ను నియమిస్తాడు. ఇంకా ఏమైనా పండించవలసివస్తే, వాటికి ఇంకా కొంత మందిని నియమిస్తాడు. ఖాస్సామి ఇటువంటి ప్రయత్నము చేసేటప్పుడు, ఆ tenants కు ఆయా పంటలవల్ల లాభము ఉన్నదా లేదా అనేటటువంటి విషయము నిర్ణయించుకోవడానికి తగినటువంటి అవకాశము లేకుండాపోతుంది. అందుచేతనే ఈనాడు మనము tenants యొక్క హక్కులను కాపాడే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో ఈ బిల్లును తీసుకొనివస్తున్న పందర్బంబో ఇట్లు పంట పండించే హక్కును tenants కు ఇవ్వకుండా, land-holders కు ఇవ్వడమంటే ఇది ఏ రీతిగా tenants యొక్క హక్కులను రక్షించేటటువంటి బిల్లు అని అనిపించుకొనుచో ప్రభుత్వము గమనించవలసియున్నది. సాధారణముగ, land lords అంటే, నాబోటివారల్లో ఉంటారు. నాకు కొన్ని ఎకరాల ఖామి గ్రామాలలో ఉన్నాయి. కాని నేను మూలము ఎప్పుడు దేశమంతా తిరుగుతూయుంటాను. అయినా, నేనుకూడా ఒక land lord నే అనుపించుకొంటున్నాను. నా ఖామిని సాగు చేసి పండించుటకు ఎవరికో వచ్చుచెప్పడం తప్ప మరేమి ఆలోచించుటలేదు. ఆ రీతిగానే మిగతా land lords కూడా చాలా మంది ఉంటారు. అందుచేత ఖామి తనది అన్నంత మాత్రంచేత, ఆ ఖామిమీద లాభము రావాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో తనకు కావలసిన పంటను పండించమని tenants ను కోరుతాడేగాని ఆ పంట tenants కు ఉపయోగపడుతుందా, అది వారికి లాభదాయకముకాదా అనేటటువంటి దృష్టి ఖాస్సామికి ఉండదు. అందుచేత ఈ పంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కును tenants కు ఇచ్చినప్పుడే, వారు అప్పటి మార్కెటుయొక్క ధరలనుబట్టి, తనకున్నటువంటి డబ్బునుబట్టి, తాను పెట్టుకోగలిగినటువంటి పెట్టుబడినిబట్టి, దానినుండివచ్చే ఆదాయాన్ని బట్టి ఆయా పంటలను పండించడానికి వీలు ఉంటుంది. Tenants ను కాపాడవలసెంటే, ఈ హక్కు వారికివ్వవలసిన అవసరము ఎంతైన ఉన్నది. కనుక, ఈనాడు మనము tenants రక్షణార్థము ఈ బిల్లును తీస్తున్నామంటే కనీసము ఈ హక్కునా tenants కు ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. ఇది ప్రభుత్వము తప్పకుండా గుర్తించి తీరుతుందని నేను ఆశిస్తున్నాను. అలా గుర్తించకపోయినట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లు ఖాస్సాములకొరకే, వారి హక్కులను రక్షించేదానికి తీసుకొని వచ్చినదవుతుందిగాని, tenants యొక్క రక్షణకు విమోచకముకాదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రధాన మంత్రి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు గుర్తించవలసిన నేను కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Now, the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi can speak on his amendment."

27th November 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given notice of the following amendment :—

‘ Omit sub-clause (a) and re-letter sub-clauses (b) to (g) as (a) to (f).’

It will be seen that this sub-clause was not in the original Bill and it has been incorporated by the Government themselves. Now, what is the purpose of bringing this amendment. Is it generally the practice in any part of our country or in any part of this State that when once a tenant takes a land on lease (Interruption) any kind of lease, *varam* lease or ‘ kuthagai ’ or cash ‘ kuthagai ’—that the landlord should say that the tenant should grow such and such a crop on his land? It is not the practice in the Tanjore district; it is not the practice in the Coimbatore district; and it is not the practice in any other district whatsoever. Of course, customs are there. Usages from time immemorial have been there. If a landlord lets out a land on which it has been customary to grow, say for example, cotton, the tenant also grows cotton on it and if later on at a particular stage the tenant finds that it is of advantage not only to himself but also to all concerned to grow some other crop, then he will grow that crop. Therefore, fundamentally, the question as to what exactly is the kind of crop that is got to be grown thereon is decided by the tenant himself. This has been the practice from time immemorial. Now, to-day, that practice is sought to be put an end to and it is left to the landlord, by virtue of the fact that he happens to own the land, to dictate to the tenant as to what exactly is the kind of crop that should be grown on it.

“ Sir, there is a fundamental distinction between the landlord and the capitalist and what is that distinction? The capitalist who owns a factory does everything connected with the running of the factory. He engages labour. He purchases the labour power of workers. He purchases all the implements that are necessary. He purchases raw materials and he conducts the operation with the help of the labour power of workers. Now the landlord does not stand in relation to his land in the same way as the capitalist stands in relation to his factory. Because the landlord does nothing beyond receiving rent in the shape of cash or grain. This has been the practice from time immemorial. As a matter of fact it is laid down in this Bill that the landlord has not to bear all the expenses of cultivation. He has also not to bear the entire cost of manuring; and he has not to bear the cost of seeds. So he does nothing beyond receiving the rent. Now, if Government really want to go behind this specific relationship of landlord and tenant, which has been existing for the last so many years, if they want to abolish this system of landlordism and put the landlord in the position of the capitalist or entrepreneurs, I can understand it. But, is that what they are doing in this Bill? No. Therefore, I say, if we have in this Bill the clause of the Government, it will throw the way open to the landlord to evict the tenant. For, if the landlord says to the tenant that he should raise a particular

1-20
p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

crop on the land and if the tenant says that it will not be profitable to him, then, that becomes a ground for the landlord to evict the tenant. Why should we think that the landlord has more interest in production than the tenant. The other day, the Hon. Chief Minister was saying that for hundreds and thousands of years this system of landlordism has been going on, and all the same we have been having increased production. Sir, I submit this system of landlord and tenant has not been in existence for hundreds and thousands of years. It is a peculiar system born of the ryotwari system introduced by Lord Cornwallis introduced in this Presidency. It is then that land for the first time became a field for investment of money. From that time onwards we are having that system of land tenure, for the last 150 years and more under British rule. Thus along with that ryotwari system is born landlordism. Therefore to say that landlordism has been in existence from time immemorial is not correct. Can anybody say that more food has been produced and more land has been brought under cultivation under the present system of landlord and tenant? I can prove with facts and figures that it has not. In fact food production has been falling because of the fact that landlordism has been in existence for the last so many years. I am sure the Hon. Chief Minister cannot contradict me. Therefore, I ask, why should we entrust the landlord with more powers than the tenant? For hundreds of years the tenant has been choosing the particular kind of crop to be grown in the land. Now, if we give the landlord the right to determine the kind of crop to be raised on the land, what will happen is as follows. Here is a landlord who wants to get rid of the tenant. So he will dictate to him and say, 'grow cotton on my land.' But the tenant will say that it is unprofitable to him and he will therefore say, 'I can't do it.' Now this itself becomes a ground for eviction. Therefore the clause gives a loop-hole to the landlord to defeat the very object of this Bill. Here is a Bill which seeks to give protection to the tenants and pannaiyals, but that very object is defeated by the retention of sub-clause (a). Therefore I say the amendment moved by my hon. Friend must be accepted and the new amendment incorporated by Government in the Joint Select Committee stage has no relation whatsoever to the custom and practice obtaining in the country."

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR:—“ இந்தத் திருத்தத்தின் மூலம் சில விஷயங்களைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். சென்ற காலத்திலிருந்து எந்த மிராச்தாரும் நிலத்தில் இந்த பயிர்தான் போடவேண்டும் என்று இதுவரையிலும் தீர்மானிக்கவில்லை. குத்தகைக்காரர்கள்தான் அந்தந்த பிரதேசங்களில் அந்தந்த காலங்களுக்குத் தக்கவாறு பயிரிட்டு வந்தார்கள். எந்த சமயத்திலும் எந்த பயிர் போடவேண்டும் என்பது அவர்களுக்குத்தான் தெரியும். அப்படித்தான் இதுவரையிலும் அவர்கள் போட்டு வந்தார்கள். மிராச்தார்கள் வரி வசூலிப்பதுதான் தங்களுடைய வேலையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தார்களே தவிர இந்தப் பயிர்தான் போடவேண்டும் என்று குறிப்பிடுவது இல்லை. எந்தப் பயிர் செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதில் பெரும்பாலான மிராச்தார்கள் கவனம் செலுத்துவதே கிடையாது. ஆனால் இப்பொழுது அதைப்பற்றிக் குறிப்பிட்டிருப்பது ரொம்பவும் ஆபத்தானது என்பதைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். காரணம், ‘சூறு தவறினால் கப்பைபயிர்

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Venkatesa Sholagar]

யேறாது' என்பதையொப்ப காலத்திற்குத் தக்கபடிதான் பயிர்களைப் போட வேண்டும். மிராசதார்கள் ஊரில் இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். சில சமயங்களில் அவர்கள் வெளியூர்களுக்குப் போயிருப்பார்கள். சில மிராசதார்கள் வெளியூரிலேயே இருப்பார்கள். அவர்களைக்கேட்டுக்கொண்டுதான் பயிரிடவேண்டும் என்றிருந்தால் அதனால் காலதாமதம் ஏற்படலாம். தண்ணீர் வருவது 10, 15 நாட்கள் பிந்தி வரலாம் அல்லது முந்தி வரலாம். அப்பொழுது அவர்கள் ஊரில் இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டும், அவர்க ளிடம் கையெழுத்துவாங்கிக்கொண்டும்தான் பயிரிடவேண்டும் என்றிருந்தால் அதற்குள் காலம் தவறிவிடும். அதனால் சாகுபடியாளர்களை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றுவதற்கு சௌகரியமாக இருக்கும். சம்பா போடு என்றேன். வெள்ளை சம்பா எனப் போட்டாய் என்று கூறி நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்ற சௌகரியமாக இருக்கும். இந்த மாதிரி ஏதாவது சாக்குப்போக்குச் சொல்லி விவசாயிகளை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றுவார்கள். இப்படி 'வேண்டாத பெண்டாட்டியின் கால் பட்டால்' குற்றம் கைபட்டால் குற்றம், என்பதைப்போல் ஏதாவது ஒரு காரணத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்ற சௌகரியமாக இருக்கும். அதனால் நிரந்தரமாக வாழ வழி இருக்காது. மிராசதார்கள் கரும்பு, வாழை, மஞ்சள் போன்றவைகள் போடவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லலாம். அதற்கு விவசாயிடம் மூலதனம் இருக்காது. அதனால் அளர்களால் அவைகளைப் போட்டமுடியாவிட்டால் இவர்களை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றிவிடுவார்கள். இதை ஒரு காரணமாகக்கொண்டு அவர்களுக்கு பாதகம் விளைவிக்கலாம். அதற்கு நான் என்ன சொல்லுகிறேன் என்றால் நிலத்தில் எந்தநத சமயத்தில் என்னென்ன சாகுபடி செய்யவேண்டும் என்ற உரிமை சாகுபடியாளர்களுக்குத்தான் இருக்க வேண்டும். அந்தந்த காலத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு, அந்தந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு, அந்தந்த பருவத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு பயிரிட சாகுபடியாளர்களுக்கு தான் நிச்சயமாக உரிமை இருக்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் உணவு உற்பத்திக்கு குந்தகம் ஏற்படாமல் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயம் செய்யமுடியும் என்பதைக் கூறிக்கொள்கிறேன். இல்லையேல் சாகுபடிக்கு குந்தகம் ஏற்படும் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு நான் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose this amendment, and in opposing it, I have good reasons behind me. There is no difficulty as far as leases in which the exact terms, as so much kalams of paddy to be given, are specified. It is only in cases of varam where the exact amount of grain is not mentioned the difficulty will come. With regard to that, generally, in that district, where the soil of the land is fit for paddy alone being cultivated and where paddy is being cultivated there will be no difficulty. And even in other areas where some other grain will be cultivated, there will not be difficulty, because, all these years the thing was going on with the co-operation of the landowner and the tenant. So I do not see what or how difficulty will arise by having the sub-clause as it is. I should say, more than the tenant, it is the landowner who will be in a better position to decide what grain would be suitable for cultivation and all that. I do not know why so much should be said by the other side in favour of the tenant, that he should have the option to decide the crop to be raised, except that there should be some other motive behind their move. Beyond that I do not see any other motive. If I accept the amendment, it will be like facilitating the tenant of my house to use the bed room as kitchen room and the drawing room as some other room. (Laughter.) So I cannot accept the amendment."

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ Sir, as pointed out by Mr. Ramamurti it is a very dangerous sub-clause we have; for, it will serve as a ground for the landlord to evict the tenant. Further it also encroaches upon the custom and usage from time immemorial which enables the cultivating tenant to decide the suitable crop to be raised. Suppose the landlord wants to raise a rich and commercial crop like sugarcane and the tenant may not be in a position to raise it; then, the landlord has got under this sub-clause an excuse to evict the tenant. Therefore I once more request the Government to accept the amendment to omit the sub-clause.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I have nothing to say more than what I have already said.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ Omit sub-clause (a) and reletter the other sub-clauses.’ ”

The amendment was lost.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

Clause 7—contd.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ శ్రీమంతులు,

‘ At the end of sub-clause (a) insert the following :—

“ When a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and the land owner the Conciliation Board's order will be final.” ”

అనే నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ తీసుకురావడంయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యం ఏమిటంటే ఈ బిల్లు గురించి ఇంతకుముందు చొక్కిన చర్యల వల్ల, ఇవిరకు లేనటువంటి ఈ కొత్త క్లాజును ఇప్పుడు తీసుకువచ్చారని వ్యవహరిస్తున్నాం. చానిని చురల తీసివేయడం జరుగదుగా. కనీసము పంటను నిర్ణయించుకొనేటటువంటి హక్కు నైన landholders కి కాకుండా tenants కు ఇవ్వడమనేది చాల ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిది. ముఖ్యంగా కొలదారుకే ఈ హక్కు ఇవ్వవలెనని అనుకొంటాను. ఈ సందర్భంలో ఒక విషయము ఆలోచించవలసివస్తుంది. ఖామిని rent కు ఇస్తున్నారా, లేక కొలుకు ఇస్తున్నారా అనేదాన్ని బట్టి పంట ఎవరు నిర్ణయించాలనేదాన్ని పరిష్కరించవలసివస్తుంది. ఖామిని కూలికి చేయించేటట్లుంటే, అందులో పంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు ఖాస్వామికి వెండుతుంది. లేకుండా ఖామిని కొలుకు ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఆ పంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు కొలదారుకే ఉండవలసివస్తుంది. ఇప్పుడు ఈ హక్కును కొలదారుకు లేకుండా, ఖాస్వామికి ఇచ్చారు. ఈ హక్కు ఖాస్వామికి ఇవ్వడంవల్ల, ఈ పంట నిర్ణయం విషయంలో తన ఆధికారాన్నే ప్రధానంగా భావించుకొని, కొలదారుయొక్క సలహాని, అతని స్థితిగతిని గుర్తించడు. ముఖ్యముగా ఖామి కొలకు ఇచ్చినపుడు, ఈ పంటను నిర్ణయించేటటువంటి హక్కు ఆ రెండుకీ అనగా కొలదారుకే ఆత్రుతుండిగాని ఖాస్వామికి మూతముకాదు. కనుక ముఖ్యమంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించి, ఇప్పుడు ఈ హక్కు కొలదారుకు ఇచ్చేందుకు ఒప్పుకోలేదుగా, పోని, ఈ రెండు వర్గాలకు సమ్యక్

27th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

తంజా న్యాయం నిర్ణయం ఇచ్చేందుకు conciliation board కైనా ఈ అధికారాన్ని ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, కొలుదార్లకు ఎక్కువ అన్యాయము జరుగకుండా ఉండేందుకు ఏమంటుంది. కనీసము tenant కు ఈ అనుకూలమైనను కలుగజేయవలసిందని కోరుతూ ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—"I second the amendment."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, while supporting the amendment which has been moved by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, I wish to point out at the outset that this Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is a Bill which is mainly intended for the tenants as well as the pannaiyals. It must be very clear to the House as well as to the people of the State that this Bill is not being brought forward to protect the interests of the landowners. Such being the case, if power under a provision like the one which has been passed in the morning is put into the hands of the landowner, I feel it will be a dangerous thing. The determination of the crop is mainly left to the landlord. I know that in practice as long as there is cordial relationship existing between the landowner and the tenant, or the cultivating tenant and the pannaiyal, the determination of the crop can be conveniently decided by the landowners. But, in cases where a dispute arises between the landowner and the tenant, we are in for trouble and we are purchasing the same in large quantities. A landowner who has got the wilful intention of victimising his tenant can use this provision to his advantage and demand of the tenant that a crop which is impracticable of being grown on the land be raised. Crops which are beyond reasonable possibilities of human effort may be asked to be grown on the land in the event of an amendment like this being lost. In the morning I was suggesting to the Hon. the Chief Minister that in cases where the crop to be grown is decided by mutual consultation between the landowner and the tenant, there will be an end to this and that in regard to cases where they do not agree upon the kind of crop to be grown, the decision may be left to the Conciliation Board. It is the usual practice and it has also been my experience that the tenant goes to the landlord before the seedling season and tells him the kind of crop which he, the tenant, will be raising. Sometimes, he also takes the advice of the landowner but, if a landowner wants to tease the tenant or wants to evict him from cultivating his land he can use this provision which is dictatorial in character and highly mandatory. I would therefore request the House to consider this amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah dispassionately and not as one emanating from the Opposition. We have no other prejudices in trying to force the Government to accept this amendment. The intention or the motive that is actuating us is that production should not be stopped or curtailed. In the preamble it is made very clear that this Bill has been brought forward to maintain cordial relationship between landlord and tenant in the Tanjore district. If that is the intention, the framers of the Bill must take

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [27th November 1952]

care to see that they do not help in increasing the misunderstandings between landlord and tenant and that they do not come in for more trouble from the tenants. Thank you, Sir."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అధ్యక్ష, నేను

3-10 P.M. ఈ సవరణను బలపరస్తున్నాను. దీంతో ఉన్న విషయము అతి స్పష్టముగా కన్పిస్తున్నప్పటికీ చాలా ముఖ్యమైనదిగా తీసుకోవలసియున్నది. ఎందువల్లనంటే, ఏ రకమైన పంట వేయాలి అని నిర్ణయించే హక్కు ఇప్పుడు మిరాశిదారుకు అంటే ఖాస్వామికి వదలిపెట్టబడినది. దీని ప్రకారము మిరాశిదారు నిర్ణయించుటవంటి పంటను tenant వేయకపోయినట్లైతే, మిరాశిదారు అప్పుడు ఏమి చేస్తాడు, tenant ను ఖామినుంచి వెళ్లగొట్టడానికి ఆవకాశమున్నదా, లేదా అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. ఖాస్వామి నిర్ణయించుటవంటి పంటను tenant వేయకపోతే ఏవిధమైన పంటవంటి చర్య తీసుకోవాలి, ఏమి జరిగాలి అనేదాన్ని గురించి దీనిలో ఏమి లేదు ఇటువంటి సందర్భములలో జరిగిందంటే అనగా ఖాస్వామి నిర్ణయించిన పంటను tenant వేయకపోయినప్పుడు, దానికి పరిష్కార మార్గము ఈ బిల్లులో లేకుండా ఉండడము హాస్యాస్పదంగా ఉంటుంది. ఇటువంటి సందర్భములో ఖాస్వామి ఒకవేళ దీనిని కోర్టుకు తీసుకొని వెళ్లితే, సర్వసాధారణంగా అక్కడ కౌలుదార్లకు వ్యతిరేకమైన తీర్పు రావడం జరుగుతుంది. అందువల్ల మిరాశిదార్లకు, కౌలుదార్లకు ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు, అభిప్రాయ భేదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు వీటిని పరిష్కరించే అధికారాన్ని Conciliation Board కైనా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, కొంతవరకు గాకపోయినా కొంతవరకైనా న్యాయమైన పరిష్కారం జరిగేందుకు ఆవకాశముంటుంది. ఈ విషయాన్ని సెలెక్షన్ కమిటీలోనే చెప్పాము. కనుక నేను ఇప్పుడు నిగతా మంబర్ల, కంటా విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను—ఇటువంటి తగాదాలేమి లేకుండా ఉండవలసినది మీ ఉద్దేశ్యమైతే మీరు తప్పకుండా ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించాలి, లేకపోతే ముందుకు తగాదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు ఇవన్నీ కమ్యూనిష్టులవల్ల వచ్చినవి, ఈ రీతిగా వచ్చినాయి, ఆ రీతిగా వచ్చినాయి అని చెప్పుటకు ఆవకాశము కలిగిస్తారు. కనుక ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు, ఆరోపణలు పని లేకుండా ఉండడానికిగాను ఈ సవరణ చాలా అవసరమైనది. ముఖ్యంగా పానా పంట వేయాలి అనే నిర్ణయాన్ని ఎప్పుడైతే ఖాస్వామికి వదలి వేస్తారో, అప్పుడు తప్పని సరిగా ఖాస్వామి నిర్ణయించిన పంటను కౌలుదారు వేయకపోతే ఏమి జరుగుతుంది అనేది నిర్ణయము చేయవలసియున్నది. దీనికొరకు ఇక ముందైన మరిల దీనికి amendment తీసుకొని రావలసిన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడుతుంది. నిజంగా ఈ బిల్లును తీసుకురావడములోని ఉద్దేశ్యము సెలెక్షన్ కమిటీ, కౌలుదార్లకు రక్షణ ఉండాలి అన్నట్లయితే, కనీసము ఈ సవరణను అయినా అంగీకరించాలి. లేకపోయినట్లయితే, మీరునుకొన్నది ఒకటైతే ప్రతిఫలము మరొకటి అవుతుంది. కనుక ఇవన్నీ దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లులోని ఈ క్లాజు చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిది. ఎందుకనగా ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రములో అన్ని జిల్లాలోను, ఎక్కడ చూచినప్పటికీ, కౌలుదార్లే అనగా రైతులే పంటలు వేస్తున్నారు. వారే ఈ పంటలను నిర్ణయించి ఆ ప్రకారము చేస్తున్నారు. వారికే ఈ హక్కు ఉన్నది. ఎందువల్లననగా, ఏ పంట ఏ season లో వేస్తే, ఎక్కువ లాభదాయకము అనేటటువంటి విషయము ఖామి దున్నే రైతుకే తెలుసును. ఏవో ఇతర ఉద్యోగాలలోను, లేక వ్యాపారములోను నిమగ్నై ఉండే ఖాస్వాములకు ఏ season లో ఏ పంట వేయాలి అనేటటువంటి విషయాలు, ఆ పంటలయొక్క సూత్రము

27th November 1952] [Sri M. Narayanaswami]

తెలియదు. ఒకవేళ, దీని ప్రకారము ఖాస్యామిక్ పంట నిర్ణయించే హక్కు ఇచ్చి నట్లైతే, అప్పుడు ఫలానా పంట వేయాలనుకొన్నప్పుడు, ఆ పంటకు కావలసిన నారు దొరుకుతుందా, లేదా, ఆ విత్తనాలు ఎక్కడ దొరుకునో, అవి దొరుకునో లేదో అనే విషయాలు ఖాస్యాములకు తెలియవు. అందుచేత వారు నిర్ణయించిన పంటకు అనుకూల పరిస్థితులు లేనప్పుడు, ఆ పంట వేయక పోవడం జరుగుతుంది. అప్పుడు ఖాములు వృధాగా వదలి పెట్టబడి, పంట లేకుండా నష్టము సంభవిస్తుంది.

“రెండవది, ఈనాడు ఎక్కడైనా గాని ఈ పంటను నిర్ణయించేటటువంటి హక్కులను గురించి, ఖాస్యాములకును, రైతులకును ఘర్షణలు, తగాదాలు ఉన్నాయా అంటే ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు చాలావరకు లేవనే చెప్పాలి. ఎందుకనగా అన్నిచోట్లను రైతే ఈ హక్కు గలిగి యున్నాడు. ఇది సాంప్రదాయంగా వచ్చి వుంటుంది. దీనిని ఖాస్యాములు కూడా అంగీకరిస్తున్నారు. అలాంటప్పుడు దీనిని రేకెత్తించి రైతులకు ఉన్నటువంటి హక్కును ఈ బిల్లు మూలకంగా ఖాస్యామికి ఇస్తున్నారు. ఈ బిల్లు విషయము గురించి కొంతమంది కాంగ్రెసు మిత్రులు మాట్లాడుతూ ఇది ఖాస్యాముల రక్షణ బిల్లు కాదని వాదించారు. కాని ఈ క్లాజును తీసుకురావడంబట్టి ఇది ఖాస్యాముల రక్షణ బిల్లేనని నిరూపించుటకు ఇంతకంటే వేరే రుజువు అవసరము లేదు. ఖాస్యాముల రక్షణకొరకే మీరు ఈ క్లాజును పొందుపరచారని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈనాడు ఏలాంటి తర్జనభర్జన లేకుండా సాంప్రదాయంగా గ్రామాలలో రైతులు కలిగి యున్నటువంటి ఈ హక్కును వారికి లేకుండా, ఖాస్యాములకు ఇస్తున్నారంటే, ఈ బిల్లు ఎవరి రక్షణకై తీసుకొని రాబడినో గ్రహించుకోవచ్చును. న్యాయంగా ఈ హక్కును రైతులకే ఇవ్వవలసి యున్నది. కాని ఇప్పుడు అది కాదంటున్నారుగదా, పోనీ రెండు పక్షాలు కలిసి, ఖాకామందులు రైతులు కలిసి నిర్ణయించుకొనేందుకైనా అనుకూల మివ్వాలి. ఈ విషయములో రెండు పక్షాలు అంగీకరించడం చాలా సలబుగా ఉంటుంది. ఈనాడు చాలామంది ఖాకామందులు ఇక్కడ హాజరు ఉన్నారు. వీరికి ఈ హక్కు యిచ్చినచో వీరు అధికాహారోత్పత్తి చేయగలరేమో చెప్పగలరా? వ్యవసాయము చేయకపోయినప్పటికీ ఖాకామందులుగా ఉన్నారు. వీరికి, ఎప్పుడు ఏ పంట వేయాలో, ఏ నాడు వేయాలో ఏ విత్తనాలు వేయాలో, ఏ ఎరువు వేస్తే అధిక పంట వస్తుంది అనేటటువంటి విషయాలు తెలియవు. కనుక స్వయముగా వ్యవసాయము చేస్తున్నటువంటి రైతులకే ఇవన్నీ తెలుసును కనుక వారికే ఈ హక్కు ఉండుట న్యాయము. అవిధంగానే అంగీకరించాలి. పోనీ కనీసము ఈ రెండు పక్షాలైనా ఈ విషయములో స్థానముండేట్లయినా చేయవలసి యున్నది. అప్పుడు రైతుకు చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుతుందా ఉంటుంది, పంట కూడా బాగా పండేందుకు వీలుగా ఉంటుంది. కనుక ఇరు పక్షాలకు అంగీకారముండే టటువంటి ఈ సలహానైనా అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI S. VEMIAH :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this essential and most important amendment because the landowners usually do not know which crop is to be grown on a particular kind of land and the tenants who are the actual cultivators know it much better. Therefore, if this most important amendment is not properly considered, accepted and made part of the Bill, the entire spirit behind this legislation would be lost. Instead of helping the tenants it may go to help the landlords. My submission is that the Government should accept this very small but essential amendment and, with this, I resume my seat.”

[27th November 1952]

* SRI M. KUNE RAO :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ సవరణను బలపరచుట ఒక ప్రధాన మైపుటటుంటి విషయాన్ని నేను చెప్పవలసివచ్చింది. ముఖ్యంగా కాలదారు యొక్క స్థితి చూచినట్లయితే, పంట గనుక తగ్గినట్లయితే ఖాస్యామి ఆ కాలదారును తొలగించవచ్చు అని మరొకచోట ఈ బిల్లులో చెప్పబడియున్నది. అటువంటి పూడు, ఈ రోజు గనుక పంటవేసే నిర్ణయము ఖాస్యాముల చేతులలోనే ఉన్నట్లయితే కాలదారుని తన చేతులలో వుంచుకోచూచే ఖాస్యామికి ఇది గొప్ప అవకాశముగా విర్వడుతుంది. విలాగైనా చిక్కులు తీసుకొనివచ్చి కాలదారును తొలగించే ఉద్దేశముతో తాను ఫలానా పంటవేయవలెనని నిర్ణయించినప్పుడు, అపంటకు సరియైనటు విత్తనాలు వేయకపోయినప్పుడు అపంటకు సరియైన కాలమాన పరిస్థితులు అనుకూలంగా లేకున్నప్పుడు ఆ పంట సరిగాపండదు. ఎప్పుడైతే అవిధంగా పంట తగ్గిపోతుంటే, ఆ కారణాన్ని సాకుగాపెట్టుకొని కాలదారును ఖాస్యామి తొలగించవచ్చును. కనుక ఖచ్చితంగా పంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు కాలదారుకే ఉండాలి. లేనిపక్షంలో కనీసము, వీరిరువురి మధ్య బేదానిప్రాయాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు, దీనిని పరిష్కరించే అధికారము conciliation board కైనా యిస్తే కాలదారుకు ఎక్కువగా అన్యాయము జరుగదు. కనుక ఈ విధంగా చేయవలసిందని కోరుచూ, ఈ సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

3-20
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad to note the growing faith in the conciliation agency. I wish this feeling had been exhibited in the earlier stages of the discussion of the Bill. I submit that this amendment is not necessary because there is ample provision made in clause 13 for dealing with such matters. Clause 13 (1) states :

‘any dispute between a landowner and a cultivating tenant or between either of them and a pannaiyal, including any matter which affects their mutual harmonious relationship in the cultivation of land, or any question which may arise as to the terms of a tenancy or the payment or non-payment of any rent or wages shall, on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.’

So there is no necessity for any amendment. I oppose the amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, రివిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు ఒక క్లాజును ఇవ్వడం వదిలి వినిపించారు. కాని నేను ఏ point అయితే సవరణలో తీసుక వచ్చాకో ఆ point తప్ప శక్తిగలదంతా అందులో ఉంది. నేను ఈ సవరణలో తీసుకువచ్చినటువంటి విషయము వారు చదివినటువంటి క్లాజుకింద పరిష్కారము చేసుకోవచ్చునన్నారు. అది ఎట్లు సాధ్యమో నాకు అర్థముకావడం లేదు. అసలు, ఖాస్యామి వీ పంటవేయడమనేదాన్ని నిర్ణయించే హక్కునుగురించి ఈ sub-clause (a) లో the landowner shall be entitled to determine the crop or crops which shall be grown on the land అని విశదముగా యున్నది. అయితే ఈ విషయములో tenant కు landowner కు అప్రసాయ బేధముగాని, తగాదాగాని వచ్చినప్పుడు విమిచేయాలి తెలియదు. దీన్ని ఎట్లు పరిష్కరిస్తారో చెప్పలేదు. మంత్రిగారు 13 వ క్లాజు చదువుతూ

‘including any matter which affects their mutual harmonious relationship in the cultivation of land, or any question which may arise as to the terms of a tenancy or the payment or non-payment of any rent or wages shall on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.’

27th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

ఈ విధంగా Conciliation Officer కు సర్వాధికారము ఇవ్వబడిందని అంటున్నారు. అయితే నేను చెప్పేటటువంటి point ఇందులో లేదు. మంత్రిగారు కనుక ఈ point అందులో ఉండని చూపించి నన్ను convince చేస్తే చాలు. నాకు కావలసింది అసలు ఆ point కాని నా సవరణ సెగ్మెంటులో పోతుందా అనేది కాదు. దానిలో నా amendment యొక్క point లేదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. కనుక నా amendmentను బలపరుస్తూ press చేస్తున్నాను."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I know, under the Rules, I will not be allowed to speak. As Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnayya expressed his views in Telugu language many hon. Members may not have understood his views. The point which we are trying to put before the House is this. The Hon. Minister has drawn our attention to clause 13"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We have understood what Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah had said."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I only want all Members of the House to understand the views expressed by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am not going to allow the hon. Member to speak. It is a wrong procedure. If the hon. Member wants to translate the speech of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, I will allow it."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I am translating his speech. The Hon. Minister has drawn our attention to clause 13 (1) which states :

any dispute between a landowner and a cultivating tenant or between either of them and a pannaiyal, . . . shall, on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer."

This provision does not include the point which we want to be included in sub-clause (a) of clause 7, namely, that 'when a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and landowner the Conciliation Board's order will be final.' Clause 13 (1) includes every other difference of opinion between the landlord and tenant except the difference of opinion which would arise over the crop to be grown. That is the point which we wish to stress."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The hon. Member Sri Vinayakam said that he would only translate, but I am afraid he did not translate. Sri Vinayakam should understand that clause 13 is so wide that it includes every dispute. If we put in a particular dispute, it will exclude other disputes. As it is clause 13 includes every dispute."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'At the end of sub-clause (a) insert the following :—

"When a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and the landowner the Conciliation Board's order will be final." "

The amendment was lost.

[27th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" I beg to move—

(i) *Insert in the beginning of sub-clause (b) the words " Subject to clause (c) below," and change initial capital letter of " The " to small type.*

(ii) *In sub-clause (c), third line, for the word " including " substitute the word " and ".*

(iii) *In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, for the word " lower " substitute the word " Other ".*

These amendments, I submit, are only for correcting drafting errors and are of a consequential nature."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me make the amendments quite clear. The hon. Members will see, reading sub-clauses (b) and (c), that it is not correct to divide them into separate clauses because sub-clause (c) cuts into sub-clause (b). Therefore the words ' Subject to clause (c) below ' are introduced in the beginning of sub-clause (b).

" We have provided that the tenant shall be responsible for all labour and expenses of cultivation. We have also provided for manuring expenses to be divided. Therefore in sub-clause (c), third line, the word ' and ' has been proposed instead of the word ' including ' because groundnut cake is not an artificial manure.

" In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, the word ' lower ' is not correct. It should be ' other proportion '. Therefore the word ' other ' has been proposed instead of the word ' lower '."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

(i) *Insert in the beginning of sub-clause (b) the words " Subject to clause (c) below ", and change initial capital letter of " The " to small type.*

(ii) *In sub-clause (c) third line, for the word " including " substitute the word " and ".*

(iii) *In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, for the word " lower " substitute the word " other ".*

The amendment was carried.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—" I beg to move—

' To sub-clause (c) of clause 7, add the following proviso:—

" *Provided that the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilizers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made only at the time of sharing the crop or payment of rent as the case may be.*"

" In the amendments that have been accepted by the Government, the principle has been accepted that if the entire cost of chemical fertilizers and other artificial manures and groundnut

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

cakes is to be borne by the tenant, it may not be possible for him, in the existing circumstances, to find the wherewithal to advance the cost of manures and therefore it was decided that the cost of fertilizers and other artificial manures and groundnut cake should be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the gross produce is divided between them. Having made that provision, there must be some provision by means of which the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilisers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made at the time of sharing the crop. The tenant's portion of the cost of manuring can be recovered from him by the landowner after the harvest is over. The amendment is suggested only with a view to see that manuring is actually done. If this amendment is not accepted, what would happen? The landowner may not have any responsibility whatsoever in meeting the entire cost of manuring. Of course the Government may say that it will be to the interest of the landowner to advance the money to the tenant for manuring. If it is said that the tenant must be able to find the money for his share, he may not be able to do so and the total production may go down.

“ Therefore, Sir, it looks very reasonable and in fact, it is reasonable that the landowner must be told to advance money for manuring, unless the Government themselves are prepared to advance money for the purpose to the tenant by way of takkavi loans and especially when the Government themselves do not want to ask the landowner to advance money to the tenant, we want the Government to advance takkavi loans. When we do not give the tenant even occupancy rights, how can he be given takkavi loans under the existing law unless the landlord stands guarantee for it? Therefore the Government should see to it that the tenant gets the wherewithal to advance money for the purpose of manuring the field. Some provision should be made for it. I therefore commend my amendment for the acceptance of the Government.” 3-30 P.m.

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఆధ్యక్షా నేను ఈ (amendment) ను బలపరచుట (భర్తృత్వము వారిని దీనిని తప్పకుండా ఆమోదించమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇది చాలా చిన్న (amendment) మరియు ఇది ఆనందమైనది. ఇది లేకపోయినట్లయితే ఆయా కంటేరు తగిన (manure) వేయడం మొదలగు వాటికి చాలా ఖర్చు అవుతుంది. కనుక కంటేరు భాగా శంకారం లే కుంభముగా ఈ (amendment) ను ఆమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am very glad that this amendment has been proposed—not that I accept it. I am very glad because it proves to the hilt the necessity for the landowner to co-operate with the tenant and all these claims that the landowner is a nobody, he is not interested in the land and he is a blackguard, fall to the ground. This shows clearly that at the present moment the tenants do depend upon the landowner and that is admitted by the Opposition. But that is not the point here.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

Sub-clause (c) entirely covers the ground. This amendment only wants to throw the burden on the landlord as creditor for lending money to the tenant. I submit this is quite unnecessary and we cannot go on laying down a compulsory condition for borrowing and lending. The obligations have been settled on the main provision and let us leave things to agreement and mutual understanding. As observed by Mr. Ramamurthi himself many people give loans and there is no reason why the tenant should be compulsorily made a debtor to the landowner. He may be an independent man; he may borrow from his neighbour or anybody else. We are here only to lay down obligations of the landowner and the tenants. As to how they could get accommodation from one another is not a thing which, I submit, should be introduced into this Bill.

"Secondly, if we put down the necessity of the landlord lending money, disputes will arise as to whether the fertilizer is at all necessary, or whether it is put on the land or not. So, all these issues will come in and complicate the situation. I wish to submit for the consideration of the Opposition, a political reason. This sharing of the cost of manure was not an obligation in the original Ordinance as it was issued or in the Bill as published. When the Joint Select Committee discussed the proposals, mirasdars and landowners met and wanted this thing to be done, namely, that the landowner should bear a share of the cost of manure. It was gracious on the part of the landowners to offer to bear a part of the cost of manure. As I said, it was not in the original Bill and the Government accepted the Landowners Association's proposal. Why should we spoil that grace by saying that a duty has been cast upon the landowner to lend money for manure? I think we had better leave it where it was. The landowners have come forward to bear the burden and we have put that burden on them."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"On a point of information, Sir. The Hon. Chief Minister was telling us that the landowner will advance such amount of cash as is necessary to purchase fertilizers or chemical manure."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"When did I say so?"

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"We presume that for the purchase of manure it is the landowner that will come to the aid of the tenant. In such a case, while collecting back the cost of manure will the landowner include the interest also for the money he has advanced for the purpose?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"God forbid."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, the reason why I am not able to accept the explanation of the Hon. Chief Minister is that he has got a tremendous faith in the landowner and he has got considerable distrust as far as the peasants are concerned. Unfortunately I do not share his view. I say that he has got a tremendous

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

amount of distrust as far as the tenants are concerned. I shall come to that later. It is said that somebody said that it is the landowner that has the responsibility of manuring and if it is put entirely as the responsibility of the tenant, then he cannot properly manure the land because he may not have the money to do that. That is taken to be the resolution of all the landowners"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is not somebody. They met in a conference over which Mr. Bhashyam presided and it is he that pressed for it."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Bhashyam might have pressed for it at the Select Committee"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" When I said 'you are putting a burden on the landowner', he said that it was their solid resolution at the conference and it was on their behalf he said it."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Then my position becomes simpler. Here are the landowners who according to the Chief Minister are anxious to see to it that they advance money. Then what difficulty is there in providing for it legally."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Your neighbour has pointed out the difficulty."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Probably because interest will be demanded. If the landowners are so very generous and have come forward of their own accord to share a part of the manuring charges, I ask, what difficulty is there in providing for the advance of the entire portion of the cost of manure by the landowner in a legal manner?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" As I have explained, why do you spoil the grace?"

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Merely because the landowners passed a resolution, is it to be thought that all the landowners are going to stick to it? A number of them do not have that view. I may tell the Hon. Chief Minister that he may have that faith in the landowners and I know that by and by his faith in them will get thoroughly disillusioned. If he looks at the problem in an objective way, he will disabuse himself of the trust which he reposes in the landowners. The fact is there that some association or somebody proposed something and he accepted it. Therefore, Sir, I would like to press my amendment because this does not entail any new responsibility but it is a responsibility which they themselves have accepted. Therefore take them by their word and make them responsible under law that they should contribute towards the cost of manuring."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I think, this amendment is not desirable because as things stand

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [27th November 1952]

the landowners and the tenant know when to manure and the tenant is prepared to manure the land. That is customary. If you allow it to be postponed to a later stage, the tenant will spend away all the money and he will find it difficult to pay it and it will lead to a lot of litigation and it will also spoil the good relationship that exists between the landowner and the tenant. So, I cannot accept the amendment."

Mr. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

To sub-clause (c) of clause 7, add the following proviso:—

"Provided that the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilizers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made only at the time of sharing the crop or payment of rent as the case may be." "

The amendment was lost.

Sub-clause (f).

* Sri D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely:—

'Omit sub-clause (f).'

"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులో సబ్.క్లాజ్ (f) క్రింద ఖాస్సామి రీ సంవత్సరముల కాలము తరువాత కొలు ఒడంబడికను రద్దు చేసేదానికి అతనికి అధికారమివ్వబడినది. ఈలాగు ఖాస్సామికి అధికారమివ్వబడడమంటే రైతును నష్టము పాలు చేయడంతప్ప ఇంకొకటికాదు. సర్వదా ఖామి తన అధీనములో ఉండి నష్టమే రైతు ఆ ఖామికి ఎక్కువ నేవ చేసి కావలసిన ఎరువు వేసి దానిని బిడ్డవర పోషిస్తాడు. తద్వారా ఆ ఖామి సక్రమంగాను, హెచ్చుగాను పండడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. కాని ఖాస్సామికి ఈ ఒడంబడిక కాలాన్ని తగ్గించడానికిగాని, అవుడలచేసేదానికిగాని అధికారమివ్వబడితే, రైతుకు అన్యాయం జరుగుతుంది. ఆ ఖామికి తగిన ఎరువు వేయడానికి అవకాశములేకుండాపోతుంది. అప్పుడు పంట సరిగా పండడానికి ఏలుండదు. అందువల్ల అధికారహీనత్వరైని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని చూసినప్పటికీ కూడా రైతుకు ఖామిపై యిట్టి హక్కు వుండాలి. ఇటువంటి అధికారాన్ని ఖాస్సామికి ఇవ్వకూడదు. ఖాస్సామికి కావలసిందంతా ఖామి సాగుచేయబడుతున్నదా? తనకు అందులో సరియైన భాగము వస్తున్నదా? అనేగాని యితర విషయాలలో అతనికి జోక్యం వుండరాదు. రైతుల (tenants) ను తమ ఇష్టప్రకారం తొలగించేందుకు అధికారముండకూడదు. కనుక యీ సవరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుచున్నాను."

3-40
p.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I second the amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I am, afraid the hon. Member is seconding the amendment without understanding the implication. Omission of sub-clause (f) is the same as the proposal to make the tenancy automatically permanent. When that proposal was lost, this amendment has no place. Omission of sub-clause (f) means omission of even notice."

27th November 1952]

*SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లు ఇంకా చట్టము కాలేదు. కాబట్టి, చివరనైనా దీనిని త్రోసివేసే అవకాశమున్నది. కనుక ముందుగా ఒక క్లాజు (clause) పాస్ అయినదని అందుకు వినిపించుకొన్న నా సభరణను తీసికొన్నాడని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పడం సరిఅయినటువంటిదిగాదని నా అభిప్రాయము.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The question is—
'Omit sub-clause (f).' ”

The amendment was lost.

*SRI K. RANGA RAO :—“అధ్యక్ష, నా సభరిణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

'For the existing sub-clause (f) substitute the following :—

“The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of land unless otherwise decided by Court of law.”

“ఈ బిల్లును తెచ్చిపెట్టినటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యం ఏమిటంటే, అక్కడ ఇస్తుంటుంటే పాలేరులను ఖాస్సాములు తీసివేస్తున్నారని, అటువంటివన్నీ ఖాస్సాములకు కౌలుదారుకు ఏ విషయములైనా తగినా వచ్చినప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లు ప్రకారం ఏ సంవత్సరముల తరువాత కౌలుదారును తొలగించే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో ఖాస్సామి కౌలుదారుకు ఒక సంవత్సరం ముందుగానే గడువు ఇస్తూ తప్పకుండా తొలగించవచ్చు. అటువంటివన్నీ కౌలుదారు ఖాస్సామినుంచి తొలగించబడి నిస్సహాయతతో ఉండుట జరుగుతుంది. అలాంటివన్నీ ఈ బిల్లు కౌలుదారుకు రక్షణ ఇచ్చేటువంటిదని ఏ విధంగా అనిపించుకొంటుందో అలాచింతవలసియున్నది. ఖాస్సామికి ఇటువంటి అధికార మివ్వడంలో ఈ బిల్లు కేవలము ఖాస్సాముల రక్షణకొరకే తీసుకొని రాబడినదవుతుంది. కనుక కౌలుదారుకు నిద్రపైస రక్షణ కలగాలంటే, ఏ సంవత్సరముల తరువాత కౌలుదారును తొలగించే అధికారము ఖాస్సామికి ఇవ్వకుండా, ఈ అధికారాన్ని కోర్టుకే ఇవ్వవలసిందని కోరుతూ, ఈ సభరణను అంగీకరించవలసిన మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.”

SRI S. VEMIAH :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment for the following reason. If a notice of eviction at the end of the fifth year is served on the tenant at the end of the fourth year, the tenant will not apply sufficient manure to the land or will neglect cultivation in the fifth year itself. This will lead to lowering of production. If there is any deficiency in production, the Court will decide and if it finds that it is due to the negligence of the tenant, it will pass orders evicting him from the land. To avoid lowering of production, it is better to accept this amendment which proposes that the tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the land unless otherwise decided by a court of law.”

*THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Sir, this amendment refers to a matter which has already been disposed of in a different form. This touches the question of permanency of tenure as it says that, unless a court of law decides otherwise, the tenant shall continue in possession of the land. Since this matter has already been disposed of, I oppose the amendment.”

[27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ For the existing sub-clause (f), substitute the following :—

“ The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of land, unless otherwise decided by court of law.” ’

The amendment was lost.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

‘ Substitute the following for sub-clause (f) :—

“ The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands as tenant for a fresh period of ten years, subject to the terms and conditions under this Act or to such other terms and conditions not being less favourable to the tenant as may be duly agreed upon between the landowner and the tenant, provided the tenant gives six months’ notice in writing before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy.” ’

“ Under sub-clause (f) as it stands, the landowner is entitled to terminate the tenancy at the end of the fifth year by giving notice to the tenant at the end of the fourth year. After the fifth year, the tenant cannot claim any right whatsoever. That is the existing position. My amendment makes it obligatory for the landlord to continue to keep the tenant, unless the tenant chooses to quit by giving six months’ notice. My amendment is quite different from the other amendments moved earlier for giving either permanency or ten or fifteen years security of tenure to the tenant. They did not give the option of termination of tenancy to the tenant. But my amendment gives the option to the tenant to terminate the tenancy by giving six months’ notice at the end of four and a half years.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ After ten years, should he continue as a tenant or not?”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Whether after ten years he should continue as a tenant or as a owner of the land, the history of this country will decide, and the tenant himself will decide. In a real democracy, the tenants will decide as to who should become the owner of the land. We need not bother about it now.

“ While opposing the principle of giving further security of tenure to the tenants yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister said that we could not do it. He did not say that it was a bad thing to create certain interests as far as tenants were concerned. Creation of those interests is a very desirable thing. Nonetheless the creation of those interests is dependent on the sweet will and pleasure of the landowner. If a tenant serves his master well for four years and the master thinks that it is to his advantage to continue the tenant, the master will continue to keep him and not get rid of him. That seemed to be the line of argument that the Hon. Chief Minister

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

adopted yesterday. I do not want to-day to enter into the question of human relations. Certainly human relations are very sacred. We cannot talk of human relations in the abstract. Human relations have a particular meaning in a particular context. There is the human relation between the slave-owner and the slave! We cannot say that the human relation between the slave and the slave-owner is the same as that between two friends or that between father and son. It is entirely different. Co-operation and human relation get meaning only when they are used in the context of two parties who are in a position to co-operate. The parties must be equal in position. Equality of status must be there. That is the pre-requisite for co-operation. To-day a particular relationship is sought to be brought about between the landlord and the tenant. Even the relationship between the husband and the wife has not been the same from time immemorial—from the time of the Bhagavad Gita. We know the particular relationship that existed between Draupadi and her five husbands. There was the domination of man over woman, and, therefore, Sita was exiled. (Interruption.) Sita was exiled because she was suspected. What is the use of talking about these relations? What is the relationship to-day which we are interested in? Do we want that kind of relationship between the husband and the wife where the husband dominates the wife or do we want that relationship that exists between two parties who are equals? Sub-clause (f) says that at the end of five years the landowner can do anything he likes with the tenant. If this sort of relationship should exist between the tenant and the landlord, I submit that it certainly will not benefit the tenant in spite of all that was talked about. The tenant should have that relationship which alone would lead to co-operation. We talk of co-operation. I would like to ask what sort of co-operation we mean. Are the tenants and landlords engaged in a joint enterprise? Are they working together? I say that they are not engaged in any joint enterprise. As far as the landlord is concerned, he is only interested in receiving his rent. (Interruption.) The landlord's interest is only to receive rent and he does nothing else. That is the situation. To talk of co-operation in these circumstances is meaningless. We must create an interest in the tenant which alone will ensure his utmost interest in the land. I frankly say that under the existing sub-clause, we cannot expect the tenant to give his utmost attention to the production of crops. There will be lot of disputes, and the tenant will not be sure that at the end of five years he will continue to be on the land. Let us also not deceive ourselves that the landlord will not understand the implications of this sub-clause. The more we discuss it here, the more the landlord will take it into his head to give notice to the tenant of the termination of the tenancy. Let us not imagine that the landlords do not know the position as to when they should give the notice of termination of the tenancy. To give this right to the landlord is a dangerous thing. We have to see that the landlord is not given this right. But the tenant must have the right at the end of five years to give notice to the landowner of the termination of the

3 50
p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

tenancy if he does not want to continue on the land. This alone will give security of tenure to the tenant. I want the Government to accept this amendment, and see that food production is increased."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I second the amendment, and in doing so, I wish to reiterate that the aim of the Bill is to give protection to the tenants. We want to protect the interests of the tenant by giving him discretionary powers to terminate the tenancy instead of giving the right to the landlord to terminate the tenancy. In all cases where notices are to be given, it is the landlord that is given the power to take the initiative, whereas the tenant is left to himself. Here we wish to give more power to the tenant. If the tenant wants to terminate the tenancy, let him give six months' notice at the expiry of the period."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, as a young student I have read the story of Jason and the Dragon. There, if one warrior was killed another warrior rose up. Here, substantially the same matter is in all the amendments. Though one amendment is disposed of, the same matter is raised in some shape or form in another amendment. I oppose the amendment."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, it is a reflection upon the Chair to say that the matter has been disposed of and that it is raised in another amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would just say that the reply of the Hon. Minister is really a reflection on the decision of the Chair. I made it clear that this amendment was quite different. It does not ask for permanent occupancy rights. It says that the tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands for a fresh period of ten years, provided he gives six months' notice before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy. It is not the same as the previous amendments. So, I press my amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of information, Sir, మాచిక్క వేలుగారికి తెలుగు బాగనే తెలుసును. Tamil మాదా కొంచెము వాడితే ఇంకా బాగ తెలుసుకొంటారు."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Obviously he does not want information. Otherwise he would not speak in Telugu."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Bombay Tenancy Act క్రింద 10 సంవత్సరముల వరకు tenancy right ఉన్నదనే విషయాన్ని మాచిక్క వేలుగారికి జ్ఞాపకంచేస్తూ, దానికి వారు ఏమీ సమాధానమిస్తారని అడుగు తున్నాను. Amendment ను press చేయడానికి ముందు వారి సమాధానము తెలుసుకోవాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Unfortunately, Sir, I do not understand the hon. Member's present Telugu." (Laughter.)

27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

Substitute the following for sub-clause (f), namely :—

“ The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands as tenant for a fresh period of ten years, subject to the terms and conditions under this Act or to such other terms and conditions not being less favourable to the tenant as may be duly agreed upon between the landowner and the tenant, provided the tenant gives six months' notice in writing before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy.” ”

The amendment was lost.

Clause 7 as amended was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will now take up clause 8. Many hon. Members have given notice of amendments to sub-clause (1). I will allow the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan to move his amendment. Other hon. Members will then speak on the amendment.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ వ్యక్తి, నా పేరుపై ఉన్న
చట్టము.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member read his amendment to clause 7.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ The amendments are—

(i) *Omit sub-clause (a).*

(ii) *At the end of sub-clause (c) add the following, namely :—*

“ And the tenant at his discretion determines the quantity and the kind of chemical fertilizers to be used on the land ”

(iii) *In sub-clause (d) after the words “ water rate ”, insert the words “ land revenue surcharge and any other charges payable to the Government on such land ”.*

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, clause 7 has been passed. If the hon. Member wanted to move his amendments to clause 7, he should have brought them to the notice of the Chair earlier. Now that clause 7 has been passed, we cannot re-open it and again discuss it.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I gave sufficient time to the House to move amendments. The hon. Member did not move the amendments when I gave time. We are now on clause 8.”

Clause 8.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan 4 p.m.
will move his amendment.”

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name :—

‘ In sub-clause (1) for the word “ two-fifths ” substitute the word “ two-thirds ”. ’

[Sri K. P. Gopalan] [27th November 1952]

“ Sir, clause 8 (1) reads as follows :—

‘Where the produce is to be shared between the tenant and the land-owner, the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths (or such higher proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the gross produce.’

Here I want to substitute the word ‘two-thirds’ for the word ‘two-fifths’. I want to submit that my amendment is a very reasonable one. According to my amendment, the tenant will get two-thirds of the gross produce and the mirasdar or jenmi will get one-third. Out of his share, the tenant will have to incur expenditure on seed, manuring, planting, etc. The balance only will remain for his livelihood. In fixing the share of the yield for the mirasdar and the peasant, we have to bear in mind that the tenant must get a living wage. The Government may say that we want to give something more to the tenant than what he actually gets now. That is not the basis on which we should consider this issue. On the other hand, we must see whether the share that the tenant will get, will enable him to lead a decent life. If we take that into consideration, we will concede that the tenant must get two-thirds of the gross produce.

“ Another thing that I want to bring to the notice of this House is this. The Congress Government have been in office in this State before and after August 1947. They were in office even before the British people left this country. All along they have allowed the exploitation by the landlords and the payment of low wages to the peasants. The Congress Government created such a condition and because of that, the peasants have become paupers and are not able to make both ends meet. After creating all these conditions, the same Congress Government have brought forward a Bill in this form which does not give a living-wage to the peasants.

“ I repeat that this amendment is a very reasonable one. Further, this is a test whether this Government stand on the side of the peasants or on the side of the landlords. I do not want to say anything more. I move my amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Hon. Members Messrs. Kune Rao, Lakshminarayana Reddi, Rama Rao and Rajagopala Rao have given notice of similar amendments. They may speak on the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Gopalan. They need not move their amendments.”

SRI M. KUNE RAO :—“ ఇప్పుడు మీరు K. P. Gopalan గారి సవరణ, నా సవరణ, శ్రీ లక్ష్మీనారాయణ రెడ్డిగారి సవరణ అన్నీ ఒకటి అన్నారు. అది సరి కాదు. నా సవరణ వేరు. అందుచే ప్రత్యేకంగా నా సవరణకు గురించి మాట్లాడాలి.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have allowed the hon. Member Sri Gopalan to move his amendment and he has moved it. Other hon. Members may speak on it.”

27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, one amendment fixes the share of the produce between the tenant and the landowner in a certain proportion, namely, 2 : 1. There is also another amendment"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Of course, there is some difference between the amendment which has just now been moved and the other amendments. Instead of 'two-thirds', Sri Kune Rao wants 'eleven-twentieths'; and Sri Lakshminarayana Reddi wants 'three-fifths'. These are all minor changes."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, there is the amendment of my hon. Friend Sri Kandasami also."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I want to make a submission. One of the most important features of this legislation is the fixation of the share of the produce between the landowner and the tenant. Let us assume that the House does not agree to 66 per cent of the produce for the tenant. Then, we will try to know whether it agrees to 60 per cent or something less than that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the discussion proceed."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The discussion may proceed, Sir, but you will please put each amendment separately to the vote of the House. It is possible that the House may agree, if not to 66 per cent, at least to a smaller figure."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let us take up the amendment which gives the largest share to the tenant."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the House may be unwilling to give 66 per cent of the produce to the tenant. But it may be willing to give 60 or 55 per cent or some lower figure. So, each amendment may be put separately to the vote of the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then, we should have a separate discussion on each amendment."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Not necessary, Sir. But please give us sufficient time to discuss the amendments, but put them separately to vote."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"All the amendments may be discussed together but they may be put to vote separately."

SRI S. VEMIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan. It is a very important amendment. The chief aim is to safeguard the interests of the tenants by giving them a bit more of the produce. But it is very regrettable that, even while the Sabrahmanyam Committee has conceded a larger share to the tenant, this Bill gives only two-fifths of the produce to the tenant, which is quite inadequate. According to this Bill, if a piece of land yields 20

[Sri S. Vemiah] [27th November 1952]

tooms, the tenant will get 8 *tooms*, whereas the landowner will get 12 *tooms*. This is the share that the tenant will get for all his hard labour. Therefore, if we really want to protect these tenants, we must improve their economic condition, and this amendment tries to do it. I second the amendment and request the Government to accept it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Amendment moved—

In sub-clause (1), for the word "two-fifths", substitute the word "two-thirds".

SRI M. KUNE RAO :—" Sir, నేను ఇప్పుడు ఉన్న కొలు రేటు భాగాన్ని నాలుగు-అరు భాగాలు అంటే కొలుదారునకు నాలుగు వంతులు, ఖాస్వామికి ఆరు వంతులు అనే రేటుకు ఒక సవరణ ఇచ్చాను. ఆ దేవుడుంటే కొలుదారునకు పదకొండు వంతులు, ఖాస్వామికి తొమ్మిది వంతులు రేటు యివ్వాలనే నా సవరణ. ఎందుచేతనంటే, ముఖ్యంగా కొలుదారు యీ చాలని పరిస్థితులలో, ముఖ్యంగా మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో యీ కొలుదారు చేసే అంకోళబట్టి వారికి రోజురోజుకు వారి జీవితము కృశించిపోతున్నదన్న సంగతి యీ గవర్నమెంటువారికి పూర్తిగా తెలిసియుండినను శ్రీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని వివరములు పరిశీలించినట్లు లేదు. ఈ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ లోగడ కాంగ్రెసు గవర్నమెంటువారివల్ల విర్సరచబడ్డదే. అటువంటి కమిటీ చేసిన సహాయకూడా సాటిరచబడలేదు. ఆ సహాయులను త్రోసివేసి మన మంత్రివర్గమువారు ఆరు వంతులు ఖాస్వామికిని, నాలుగు వంతులు కొలుదారుకునూ యివ్వడమనేది సరబుగా లేదు. సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రాష్ట్రములో వున్నటువంటి పరిస్థితులు అన్నియు గమనించియే ఈ సహాయులు చేసియున్నారు. అట్లాంటివి త్రోసివేసి యీ నాటి పరిస్థితులను గమనించకుండా ఖాస్వామికి ఆరు వంతులు కొలుదారునకు నాలుగు వంతులు రేటు విర్యాచయేయ దలచారు. ఈ విషయములో ముఖ్యంగా యీ నాటి కొలుదారు స్థితిగతులనుబట్టి కనీసము వారికి ఏ విధమైన relief అనేది లేకుండా చేస్తున్నారు. అసలు మేము దున్నేవానికి ఖామి వుండాలని అంటున్నాము కాని యిప్పుడున్న ఈ ప్రభుత్వం అది ఆమోదించదు సరికదా. కనీసం సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ చెప్పిన రేటునైనా అంగీకరించమని కోరుతున్నాము గనుక యీ విషయాన్ని కొలుదారు పరిస్థితులను యీ మంత్రివర్గమువారు దృష్టి పెట్టుకొని రేటు పెంచవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అందుకుగాను నిజంగా యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము బిల్లును కొలుదారు రక్షణకొరకే తెచ్చియుండినందుడల, శ్రీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో చేసిన సహాయులను గుర్తిస్తూ నా సవరణలో ప్రతిపాదించినటువంటి రేటు అసగా ఖాస్వామికి తొమ్మిది వంతులున్నూ, కొలుదారు నకు పదకొండు వంతులున్నూ యిచ్చేటట్టుగా, నేను చేసిన సవరణ ప్రభుత్వవారు ఆమోదించుతారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.

" నేను సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను.—In sub-clause (1) for the word 'two-fifths', substitute the word 'eleven-twentieths' అనే."

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMY AYYANGAR :—" On a point of order, Sir. This point has already been decided under clause 7. Sub-clause (c) of clause 7 says that the cost of manure shall be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the gross produce is divided between them,

27th November 1952] [Sri P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar]

that is to say, of three-fifths to two-fifths. Therefore we have taken it for granted that the produce should be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the proportion of three-fifths to two-fifths. If at all this amendment had to be considered, it should have been moved before sub-clause (c) of clause 7 was taken up for consideration. They have not done it and therefore they have impliedly consented to the division of the produce in the proportion already agreed upon under clause 7 (c). So this amendment is not in order and cannot be allowed to be moved."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I would not like such a harsh and technical view to be taken, Sir."

*SRI A. VENKATARAMA RAJU:—"అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ కూనె రావుగారు తీసుకొనివచ్చిన amendment ను నేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా యీ కౌలుదారీ వట్టుము తీసుకొనివచ్చిన సందర్భములో మన ముద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో ఉన్న కౌలుదార్ల పరిస్థితులు అన్ని యింకా దా పరిశీలించకుండానే యీ బిల్లును బిల్లు తీసుకు రాబడింది. మన కాంగ్రెసు మంత్రులకు ఈ కౌలుదార్ల పరిస్థితులు గమనించినట్లు లేదు. మన రాష్ట్రములోని కౌలుదార్ల కొరకై ఏర్పరచబడిన సుబ్బర్వణ్ణం కమిటీవారు రాష్ట్రములోని పరిస్థితులన్నియు గ్రహించి కొన్ని సిఫార్సులు చేసారు. ఈ నాడు మన మంత్రులకువారు ఆ రిపోర్టులోని సిఫార్సులు అన్నియు తోసివేసినట్లు రూడియగుచున్నది. అందుచేత నే ముఖ్యంగా యీ నాడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు కౌలుదార్లకు సహకరముగా లేని బిల్లును తెచ్చారు. ఈనాడు ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లా కౌలుదార్లకు యీ బిల్లును అన్వయపరచుటకు తెచ్చారేగాని, ముందుముందు రాష్ట్రమంతటికి అన్వయించ జేయుదురని ప్రజలకు గోచరమగుచున్నది. ఈ బిల్లువల్ల పెద్ద విప్లవం తెస్తూందని భావించనవ్వటోకి ఈ సవరణతోననే నామమిత్రంగా అయినప్పటికీ కౌలుదార్లకు ఉపయోగపడగలదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. సుబ్బర్వణ్ణం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని సిఫార్సులు రాష్ట్రములోని కౌలుదార్లకు అనుగుణంగా ఉన్నవి. ఈ విషయము శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలిసియుండును. అటువంటివాటిని యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము తోసివేసి వేరు బిల్లుగా యీ బిల్లు తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. కాని తంజావూరు జిల్లా లోని కౌలుదార్లకుగూడా యీ బిల్లు ఉపయోగపడదని వచ్చుచున్నాను. కాబట్టి వేద రైతాంగమువకు వేదిన కౌలుదార్లకు ఉపయోగపడేటటువంటి కూనె రావుగారు తెచ్చిన సవరణను ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతూ వారి సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను."

*SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—"అధ్యక్ష, నా సవరణ in line 3 of sub-clause (1) for the words 'two-fifths' substitute the words 'three-fifths' అని తెచ్చియున్నాను: ఈ సవరణ నేను మన తంజావూరు కౌలుదార్ల వట్టుము పర్పించేటప్పుడు, దానిని వ్యాసు చేసేటప్పుడు అలాచించమని కోరుతున్నాను. అన్నిటికంటే భూస్వామికి అయిదింటి మాడు యివ్వడము చాలా అన్యాయము అని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు Select Committee stage లో ప్రభుత్వమువారికి మెజారిటీ వున్నదనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో యీ కౌలుదార్లకు అన్యాయము చేసేవద్దతినే Select Committee లో యీ హిస్ మెన్ రేటును వ్యాసుచేసి యీ బిల్లు ఆ సభ యొక్క ఆమోదమునకు తెచ్చారు. నిజముగా కౌలుదార్లకు రక్షణ బిల్లును తెచ్చే బదులు బక్షణ బిల్లును కమిటీవారిచేత సిఫార్సును పొంది సభవారి ఆమోదమునకు యీ

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [27th November 1952]

నాడు బైటకు తెచ్చారు. ఈ విషయములో ఒక విషయము గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఈ దేశములో కష్టపడేది నిజంగా కొలదార్ల అయినప్పటికి యీ బిల్లులోని కొలురేటు వారికి వివిధంగాను అనుకూలముగాలేదు. తరతరాలుగా ఖామీని బాగుచేసి వంటి వండించి యీ డేజ రైతులకు అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నది. ఖామీ మీద కష్టపడే రైతుకు ఉపయోగముగా నుండుటకు తెచ్చిన యీ బిల్లు నిజంగా వారికి ఉపయోగ పడాలంటే యీ నాటి కాంగ్రెసువాదులు ప్రశ్నార్థి వేపుతూ వచ్చారే కాని, యీ కొలదార్ల కుపయోగమైన బిల్లును తీసుకురాలేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు వేపుతున్నట్లు అయిదింటి రెండుభాగములు యీ కొలదార్లకు వెండిలే, యీ కొలదార్లకు వివిధ మైన గిట్టుబాటు అగునో గుర్తించాలి. ఈ విషయములో కొలదార్లకు యీ రేటు చాలా నష్టదాయకమని వేపుక తప్పదు. ప్రభుత్వ రేటు ప్రకారము ఖామీస్వామికి అయి దింటి మూడు భాగములు, కొలదార్లకు అయిదింటి రెండు భాగములు యివ్వడము చాలా అన్యాయము. ఇందుకు బదులుగా సవరణలో కొలదార్లకు అయిదింటి మూడు భాగములు ఖామీస్వామికి రెండు భాగములు యిస్తేనే న్యాయమని వేపుతూ యీ సవరణ తెచ్చాను. యీ నా సవరణ ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయములో యీ కొలదార్లకిచ్చే రేటు నిర్ణయము పునరాలోచన వెయ్యాలి. దేశములో agrarian troubles నిర్మూలించుటకు యిదే ప్రధానమైనటువంటి సూత్ర ము. ఇదివరలో గాంధీగారుహడా agrarian troubles విషయములో హడా కొలు దార్లకు మూడు భాగములు యివ్వాలని సహాయం చేశారు. వైసాలో సహాయం నేక తర్యాన మెక్స్ కోట్ల పరిపాలనకు వచ్చినప్పటి పరిస్థితి, సాహదేశంలో గాంధీ మరణము తర్వాత పరిస్థితి ఒకటే. ఖామీస్వామి పాటుపడే రైతును ఎక్కువ వెండజేయవలెనని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఇది చాలా న్యాయమైన పద్ధతి. ఇదివరలో జరిగిన సమావేశపు కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని సిఫార్సులనుగాడా దీనికి భిన్నము కావని చేపుతున్నాను. కష్ట పడేవారికి ఎక్కువ హక్కు ఉండవలెనని మీరు సహాయం చేశారు. అట్లు యివ్వక పోతే దేశములో అల్లర్లు జరుగుచు దేరును. ఈ విషయములో ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఎంతో కాలంనుండి యీ కొలదార్లకు సహాయకారిగా ఉండేవారులు లేవలెనని అంటూ వచ్చారు. కాబట్టి ముఖ్యంగా యీ 3/5 భాగము కొలదార్లకున్నూ, 2/5 భాగము ఖామీస్వామికిని యిస్తేనే దేశములో కొలదార్లకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు సహాయ రక్షణ యివ్వగలుగుతారు. ముఖ్యంగా రైతు వాగుపడాలంటే కొలదార్లకే ఎక్కువ భాగము యివ్వాలని కోరుతూ నా సవరణను అంగీకరించమని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరు తున్నాను.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈనాడు జరుగుతూ ఉన్నటువంటి యీ చర్చల సందర్భములో ప్రధానమైన విషయాలనుగురించి వచ్చినప్పుడు మనము ముందు యీ వట్టియు అసలు యీ కొలదార్లకొరకై చేబడిన వట్టియు అవునా కాదా అనే విషయము చర్చించవలసియున్నది. నా ఉద్దేశ్యములో యీ యాక్టు కొలదార్లకు ఉపయోగించు వట్టిమని వేప్పినప్పుడు యిది కార్యాచరణకు సాధ్యమనా కాదా అని ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. అందుమీద మనము ప్రభుత్వమునకు నెలయజేయవలసినది ఇంకా ప్రధాన విషయము. మనరాష్ట్రములో యీనాటి పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి ముఖ్యంగా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్ల పరిస్థితి పరిశీలి చి, యీ యాక్టులోని ఆంశములు ఎంతవరకు వారికి అనుగుణముగా ఉన్నవో పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. ఇప్పటి పరిస్థితు లలో తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో కొలదార్లకు యిచ్చే కొలు రేటుకు అనుగుణ్యముగా యీ యాక్టు తయారు చేయబడలేదు. ఇందలి కొలురేటు అంగీకారయోగ్యముగా లేదు. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు వర్తింపజేయుటకు తెచ్చిన యీ యాక్టు

27th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

అక్కడ భుక్తు ఖాస్సాములకు ఉపయోగపడేదిగా ఉన్నది. కాలు రేటు అసాధారణముగా కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ చట్టములోని కాలు రేటు కాలుదార్లకు నష్టం కలుగజేసేగా ఉన్నది. ఇది ఖాస్సాములకే ఎక్కువ ఉపయోగించే చట్టము. ఈ చట్టములోని అంశములు అందుకు కాలుదార్లను నష్టపూజేగా ఉన్నవి. కాలుదార్లకు రక్షణ అనేది యెచ్చటను కనబడుతులేదు. సుబ్రహ్మణ్య కమిటీ చేసిన సిఫార్సులను సరిచియుండలేదు. ఈ చట్టములో ఒక చిన్న విషయము కనబడుచున్నది. ఒక వంట (crop) లోని భాగము ఖాస్సామికి ఉండినను catch crop వచ్చినప్పుడు గూడా ఖాస్సామికి భాగము తక్కువగా యిచ్చి తిరాలి అనేటటువంటి ఒక clause పెట్టియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము యీ పద్ధతిని అవలంబించడము ఖాస్సామికి సహాయపడటమేగాని చెప్పాలి. అందుకల్ల ఇందులో కాలుదారులకు రక్షణ అనేది కన్పించడములేదు. అట్లు చేయడములో సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ సిఫార్సులు కూడ యీ ప్రభుత్వము నిరాకరించారని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ కాలుదారి విభాగాన్ని పరిశీలించుటకు విర్బరచిన సుబ్రహ్మణ్యము కమిటీ కాలుదారుకు యివ్వవలెనే కనీస కాలురేటుగూడ యీ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రోత్సహించి, మరింత తక్కువ రేటు యీ కాలుదారుకు ఏర్పాటు చేస్తున్నది. అటువంటిప్పుడు యీ ప్రభుత్వము కాలుదారున కిచ్చే రక్షణ ఎక్కడ ఆని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఈనాడు సభ్యులు చేసినటువంటి amendments కనీసము ఒక్కటిగూడా యీ ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించడములేదు. యీ కాంగ్రెసు సభ్యులు యీ కాలుదార్లకు ఒకానొకప్పుడు elections జరిగేముందు యిచ్చిన వాగ్దానములు ఒక్కటిగూడ జరుగుతులేదు. అనాటి వాగ్దానముల, యీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ సిఫార్సులు అంగీకరించకపోతే, యీనాటి కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమునకు ప్రజలు విశ్వాసి వరు. ఈనాడు యీ కాలుదార్లయిది యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము కృత్రిమ చర్యలకు దిగింది. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వము పునరాలోచన చెయ్యవలసియున్నది. కాలుదార్లొరకు రక్షణచట్టము ఏర్పాటుచేస్తామని వాగ్దానములు చేసిన యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము అనాదిరజేయమైన స్వభావమును అవలంబించుచూ, మరి విధముగా ఖాస్సాములకు రక్షణయిచ్చి యాక్టును యీనాడు తెచ్చింది. ఈపద్ధతి నాగరిక ప్రభుత్వమునకు లక్షణముకాదు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ చట్టము పునరి పరిశీలించి, కాలుదార్లకు అంగీకారయోగ్యమైన చట్టము చేయుటకు తగినమార్పులు చేసి, ప్యాసు చేయగలండులకు తోడుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clause is in fact the life-clause of the whole Bill. As such, one ought to know on what principle this Bill has been drafted. Broadly speaking, as the title of the Bill says, is this Bill intended to protect the rights of the tenants and pannaiyals? If it is so, what is the right that the Government are going to protect under this Bill? I am afraid we cannot protect the rights of the tenants without fixing a fair-rent. The rent that is fixed according to this Bill”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member move the amendment and then speak on it so that it may be clear.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

“ In sub-clause (1), for the words “ the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths ”, substitute the words “ the tenant

[Sri C. V. K. Rao]

[27th November 1952]

shall be entitled to 55 per cent under first-class irrigation sources, 60 per cent under second-class irrigation sources and 60 per cent in all commercial crops whether raised on wet or dry lands."

The rent fixed under this clause is not at all a fair rent. It is intended only to maintain the *status quo*. Apart from the very advantageous position that is given through the Special Officers and the Revenue Courts to the landlords and thus making the whole affair a great source of never-ending litigation for the poor tenant, in this important issue of providing fair-rent for the tenant, the Bill is lacking very badly. If the intention of the Government is to protect the tenant and to secure for him a decent living condition, then they should at least look into their own archives and find out whether their own officers had at any time made any suggestions on this subject. I am not asking the Government to make any radical change in their attitude. What I am asking the Government is to gain by the experience of their own officers and find out if they have made any recommendations at all. There has been what is called the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, which has submitted its report. The Government have spent the tax-payers' money on this Committee. In the report of that Committee, certain proposals have been made. Why are this Government not accepting those proposals? After a good deal of deliberations in the Select Committee itself, the Government should have accepted the proposals that were brought before them. But they have not done so. If the Government take steps to protect the tenants at least on the basis of the recommendations of their own Officers, surely I would have agreed to it. The Government ought to have accepted and adopted those minimum proposals at least. I would like the hon. Members sitting on the opposite side and who belong to the ruling party, to realize this. As a matter of fact, this legislation is brought in order to convince the people that the Government that has come into power to-day is interested in the middle strata of peasantry. Without beating about the bush, I wish to state plainly that if this Government are really intent upon convincing the middle strata of peasantry, now here is a very nice chance and a very fair and good opportunity, to put it into practice. As I have already stated, there is no principle involved in the present clause. The only principle is to do propaganda that the Government stand for the rights of the tenants and pannaiyals. I may tell this House that mere propaganda cannot fill the stomachs of the poor people and at the earliest opportunity such propaganda will be smashed and washed out. So, here and now I am giving a little bit of warning to the Government. They should not make an eyewash of the whole thing. If they do so, there will be total failure. If they are really interested in convincing the tenants, they should take effective steps to fix fair rent. We have made certain very concrete suggestions through our amendments to the various clauses, but all of them have been turned down. But the present clause is the life-clause of the whole Bill. Hence, I hope that the

27th November 1952]

[Sri C. V. K. Rao]

Government will exhibit their sweet reasonableness—I repeat that word again—by accepting this very reasonable amendment. With these words, I conclude my speech, Sir.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను. ఈ యాక్టు డ్రాఫ్టు కమిటీ, డ్రాఫ్టు ప్రకటన కమిటీ రిపోర్టుల ననుసరించి తయారు చేసిన యాక్టుగా కన్పించుటలేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు మేము తెచ్చిన amendments అయినను ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాము. సుబ్బాస్వామి రిపోర్టులోని సిఫార్సులను యీనాడు విర్వహించిన కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము ఎందువల్ల అనుసరించలేదో చెప్పగోరుచున్నాను. కారణము చెప్పమంటే ఆ సిఫార్సులను త్రోసి వేయడము మాత్రము జరుగుచున్నది. మంత్రివర్గము (Cabinet) అయినా సరే ఎవరైనా రాధ్యత కలిగియున్నటువంటి విభాగము ననుసరించి సమాధానము చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము యీ యాక్టు విషయములో అనుసరించే పద్ధతి మంచిదికాదు. పార్టీ discipline కొరకు తగ్గించివేళామని చెప్పడం మంచిదికాదు. సుబ్బాస్వామి రిపోర్టులోని సలహాలు ఎట్లు ఉన్నవో విచారణ కూడ జరిగింది. అందువల్ల వాటిని స్వీకరించి దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. అందుకని ప్రస్తుత వాస్తవిక పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి రైతుకు ముఖ్యంగా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో రైతులకు ఖాసులునుండి తరిమివేయడం యీ విజ్ఞప్తి వచ్చింది. దీని తర్వాత డ్రాజిగోపాలాచారిగారి ఉపన్యాసంవల్ల కూడా తీవ్రత ఉడుతుంది. ఈ విజ్ఞప్తి లాభకరము అవునా కాదా అని చూచుకుంటే కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో లాభం కనబడుతున్నది మరి కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో ప్రమాదం కనబడుతున్నది. ఇదికూడా దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ఈ విజ్ఞప్తి administrative reasons తో తెచ్చాము. 4-మ. p.m. ఖచ్చితముగా మాకు దీనిలో ఇంత లాభము వస్తుంది ఇంత రాదు అనే వివరాలు చెప్పాలి. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము యీ కౌలుదారి వట్టము అనిపించుకొనెను వట్టమున ఏ principle మీద, ఏ basis మీద లేబడిందో చెప్పగోరుచున్నాను. సుబ్బాస్వామి రిపోర్టు గాని, డ్రాఫ్టు కమిటీవారుగాని, కుమరప్ప కమిటీవారుగాని, ఎవరు పట్టినను యీ కౌలుదారు రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ పాటుపడి వారికి నిజంగా చేహార్పవలసిన benefits వారు సిఫార్సుచేశారు. ఏటిలో వివియునుగూడ ఎత్తుకొనక, యీ రిపోర్టులను పీఠంగాచూచి, ఏదో ఇంకొక విభాగము అమలులోనికి తెస్తున్నారు. కనుక యీ విధంగా చేసేవివరాలు ఈ కౌలుదారులకు నష్టము కలిగించేవివరాలు, అసలు యీ యాక్టు లేకుంటేనే మంచిది అని నేను ముఖ్యంగా డ్రాజిగోపాలాచారిగారికి విన్నవించుకుంటున్నాను. అందువలన యీ విషయములన్నియు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని కనీసము సుబ్బాస్వామి రిపోర్టు వారు చేసిన రిపోర్టు ప్రకారమైనను అమలుపరచుటకు ఏటు కలిగించాలని ఆశిస్తూ, ఈ amendment ను బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“Sir, కౌలు భాగం నిర్ణయించడములో ప్రభుత్వం చేసిన ప్రతిపాదన సమంజసముగా కన్పించడములేదు. మొదట, మొట్టమొదటి పంక్తిలో మాత్రమే ఖాస్వామికి భాగము ఆంగీకరించిన ప్రభుత్వం తర్వాత సవరణలో ఖాస్వాములకు మరింత లాభాలు చేహార్పటానికి, catch crop లో గూడా, అంటే రెండో పంటలోకూడా భాగము యివ్వడం ఆన్యాయం. అంతేకాదు, ఈ రెండూ కాలక్ గడ్డిలోకూడా భాగం యివ్వమంటోంది. ఇన్స్టిట్యూషన్లు ఖాస్వాములకు భాగం తెచ్చిన ప్రభుత్వం మొదటి పంటలో ఖాస్వామికి ప్రత్యేకించబడిన వంతును తగ్గించడానికి ఏమైనా సవరణ తెచ్చిందా అంటే, అదీలేదు. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వం లిసుకొని వచ్చిన మార్పు ఖాస్వాములకే లాభకరమైనది. వాస్తవానికి ఈ విభాగంవల్ల కౌలు

[Sri K. Rajagopala Rao] [27th November 1952]

దాల్లకు చాలా సప్తము వాటిల్లుతుంది. ఎందువల్లననగా highly developed delta area లో ఇప్పుడు అమలులోనున్న కొలు రేట్లతో ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయిస్తున్న పాటును పోల్చిచూస్తే రెండూ ఇంచుమించు ఒకే రకంగా ఉన్నట్టు కనబడుతోంది. ఉదాహరణకు యకరం ఒకటికి ఇరవై బస్తాలు పండే ఘామికి పదిహేను బస్తాలు కొలు రేటు ఉన్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయిస్తున్నటువంటి share ప్రకారం చూడువంతులు ఘాస్సాములూ, రెండు వంతులు కొలుదార్లకు నిర్ణయించినట్లయితే, catch crop లా గూడా ఘాస్సామికి భాగం యిస్తే, ఇప్పుడు అమలులోవున్న కొలు రేట్లు ప్రభుత్వం చట్టబద్ధంగా యిప్పించే కొలు రేట్లు యిండుమించు ఒకటే అవుతున్నాయి. కొలు రేట్లను ఇలా హెచ్చుగా నిర్ణయించి ప్రభుత్వం ప్రస్తుతమున్న నాటిని legalise చేస్తున్నది తప్ప మరేమీకాదు. దీనివల్ల కొలుదారుకు ఎలాంటి benefit కనిపించడం లేదు. అందుకని కొలుదారుకు సహాయపడాలంటే మృబజ్జాన్స్ కమిటీ సిఫార్సులను బట్టి కొలుదారుకు 55% basis మీద కొలు రేటును నిర్ణయించాలి. అప్పుడే కాస్తన్నా కొలుదారుకు మేలు కలుగుతుంది. ఇలాంటి న్యాయమైన విధానాన్ని అంగీకరించక ప్రభుత్వం తన పట్టే పట్టుకు మార్పుంటే, చిట్లు లేవడంలాగే సదుద్దేశాన్ని శంకించవలసి వస్తుంది. కాబట్టి కొలుదారుకు మొదటి పంటలో హెచ్చు పంతు ఉండేటట్టుగానూ, రెండో పైరులో ఘాస్సామికి భాగం లేకుండానూ ఈ బిల్లును సవరించి పాస్ చేయ గోరుచున్నాను."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Members opposite have been charging the Government and the Congress party of saying one thing and doing quite a different thing; of saying that they stand for the tillers of the soil and the poor people and doing something advantageous to the few rich people. I want to submit, Sir, that years before, the Congress party has said that its policy was that the tillers of the soil shall eventually be the owners of the land. There is however one essential difference in the method proposed by Members sitting on the opposite side and the Congress party. It is that we believe in bringing about Communism in a co-operative way and not by coercion and chaos. With this essential difference the Congress party is moving towards the objective, namely, bringing welfare to the tiller of the soil and not chaos and confusion."

"Again I say this Bill is only intended to meet a particular situation that had arisen in the Tanjore district and not intended to introduce major land reforms throughout the State. If it was an enactment intended to bring in major land reforms then I would have agreed with the statements made by the hon. Members that the shares were not enough and all that. In this Bill the Government have only tried to maintain the *status quo* and not to create a new situation. We must realize that if the Government were to stipulate a different share it would affect conditions in the other districts of the State or even in the whole country. Till such time Government bring in a comprehensive legislation for land reform, let us not worry them over this question. I repeat that this Bill has been brought before us to meet a particular situation that had developed in Tanjore district and till such time they bring forward a comprehensive legislation, it is necessary that they should not create confusion in the rest of the State."

27th November 1952] [Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi]

"I have said this just to refute the statements made by hon. Members on the Opposite side that the intentions of the Congress party are not for the welfare of the people. I say our intentions are for the welfare of the people but with a difference in the ideology. With that ideology we are going forward to achieve the results which would be for the good of all people."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment that has been moved by my hon. Friend Sri C. V. K. Rao. The previous speaker, the hon. Member Sri Venkatasubba Reddi, has done the best propaganda for us by his speech, that he has just delivered. Sir, here is a Government that has issued a pamphlet through its Publicity Department claiming that this Tanjore Ordinance is a fair deal to the tenants. When we talk of a fair deal we mean there was no fair deal before. It means, before the issue of this Ordinance, the tenants and pannaiyals were not enjoying certain rights which are sought to be conferred upon them now. It means, before the issue of this Ordinance, they were not getting a fair share of the produce that they were producing and therefore we are now conferring upon them a boon. This is the propaganda that is made by the Government. Now the hon. Member Sri Venkatasubba Reddi says that this Bill does not presume to do any such thing, it only maintains the *status quo*. It is a very good statement that he has made so far as we are concerned.

"Now let us look at the provisions of this Bill, the share allowed to the tenants and pannaiyals and examine whether that is fair so far as they are concerned.

"Now here is the Congress party which had been promising to the public that they would concentrate on agrarian reforms first and foremost. The Congress party was in power, for the first time, I think, in 1937. They were in office till 1939. Three years' time. What did they do in the three years in regard to agrarian reforms? No doubt they declared in their election propaganda at that time that agrarian reform was their first problem. Can it be said that three years' time was not enough for them to undertake any land reform? What happened next? They were in office again from 1946—1951. Was anything done to effect radical land reforms? No. Several committees used to be appointed and their reports used to be shelved. There was a Congress Committee appointed by no less a person than the President of the Indian National Congress. That committee was asked to suggest suitable agrarian reforms. The Committee was known by the name 'Kumarappa Committee'. That committee produced a report. We have not seen anything of that report till now. As with several other previous reports, that too was shelved. Again recently the previous Congress Government appointed a committee called the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, presided over by an I.C.S. officer by name Mr. M. V. Subramaniam. The members of that committee were mostly Congressmen. I shall read out the names of the members. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi, one of the top-most landowners in the State, Mr. N. Ranga Reddi, who happens

4-40
p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

now to be the Public Works Minister occupying the Treasury Bench, Mr. C. Subramaniam, who now holds the key-post of Finance Minister in the Cabinet, Mr. Alluri Satyanarayana Raju, a former Congress Member of the House, Mr. Sankaran Nair, who cannot by any stretch of imagination be misunderstood as having any sympathy with the Communist party and last of all Mr. V. I. Munuswamy Pillai, a veteran Congressman. Thus we see this Committee was one of the most conservative committees ever appointed and that too full of Congressmen. At that time let us see what the picture looked like so far as the peasant movement in Tanjore was concerned. It had not assumed its present phase. The leaders of the peasant movement were at that time incarcerated and were in jail. When such was the case and there were no effective persons to voice forth the grievances of the peasants, what did the Subramanyam Committee say with regard to the peasants? Even such a conservative committee had come to the conclusion that there had been too much of rackrenting of the tenants in this State. Have the present Government accepted that decision of that committee? No, they have not. They will not accept. They say that this is not the ripe moment for effecting any change. They will again come during the next election with the cry that agrarian reform is the first and foremost of all reforms which the Congress party is pledged to undertake if it comes to power. The usual slogan will always be there. I say this Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is only an eyewash. Here is their own Subramanyam Committee report. What all we ask is only a request to the Government to implement the recommendations of that committee. But they will not yield.

“Yesterday, my friend Mr. Vinayakam asked what had happened to the pledges of the Congress during the recent elections. Let me give him an answer that the same pledges will come in the next election manifesto of the Congress. They will once again say that agrarian reform is the most important problem facing the country. Even industrialisation can come only next. Even the Planning Commission had given the greatest priority to agrarian reform. That is how they will try to hoodwink the peasants. But let me say to the Congress Government in power now, that the peasants have now opened their eyes. They can no longer be deceived. They have come to realize their responsibilities. The tenants have realized their right to their share of the produce. Let not the Congress jubilate that the poor illiterate peasants can be easily passed over. They cannot simply pass this legislation fixing the tenants' share of the produce as only two-fifths, i.e., 40 per cent. Let them not think that they have given the tenants an equitable share. The tenants are there to judge for themselves. They will be no longer carried away by the cry that the Congress is there to do all in its power to make both the landowner and the tenant lead an amicable life.

“Let us see first of all what is it that has led to the present agrarian tension in Tanjore. From time immemorial it has been the practice there for the tenants who were working in the fields

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

to take 50 per cent of the produce. In some cases they used to take even more due to the magnanimity of the landlords. Gradually with the increase in population and the consequent impoverishment of the masses, the landlords grew more jealous of the tenants' share in the produce. They were ably assisted by the successive Congress Ministries. The tenants' share of the produce gradually lessened. This gradual rackrenting of the tenants practised by the mirasdars led to the agrarian tension. The tenants so long subjugated by their mirasdars awoke and demanded equitable share in their produce. Now comes this Tanjore Ordinance fixing two-fifths, i.e., 40 per cent share of the produce to the tenants and giving them some temporary security. The peasant movement will not be satisfied with this token grant. I am not saying that they will fight it out at once. They will finally do so gradually if some piece of legislation on the recommendation of the Subramanyam Committee is not brought forward. Let it not be taken as though I am in favour of the recommendations of the Subramanyam Committee. That is an entirely different matter. What all we ask is let the peasants be given the wages prescribed for them by your own conservative Congress-cum-Subramanyam Committee. Why are the Government fighting shy to implement the recommendations of their own Congress Committee? Let not the Congress Government go on repeating their old slogans that their main attention is on agrarian reform. The people are there to judge the merits of their slogans. As a temporary measure let them accept this amendment. Let them at least give the wages prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee, which is a committee predominantly conservative in outlook and composed of their own kith and kin."

* SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this amendment. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by my friend Mr. C. V. K. Rao and so ably supported by my friend, Mr. Ramamurthi. The ownership of lands ordinarily came about by two ways, viz., either by inheritance or by acquisition by payment of money. The person who has invested money in the land no doubt expects a return. When a person invests money in gilt-edged securities, he gets an annual interest of only 3 to 3½ per cent. But the same person when he invests money on land expects a higher rate of profit. But we have to take into consideration the other side also. I was told that Tanjore is a very fertile area and normally about three crops are grown in a year. When the landlord has got such a fertile land, it is but just and fair on his part to provide his tenants who make his lands yield such good crops with reasonable wages. I feel that the wages prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee are very reasonable. That committee had gone into the whole question and arrived at proper conclusions. I think it is just and reasonable that the tenants should be given wages as prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee. With these observations, I support the amendment moved by my friend, Mr. C. V. K. Rao."

[27th November 1952]

4-50
p.m.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I rise to support the amendment moved by Sri C. V. K. Rao. A similar amendment was moved before the Select Committee, but the Government did not think of accepting it then. But some time has elapsed and I believe they have been revolving this matter in their minds. The arguments in its favour have already been stated largely. I do not want to repeat them. I only want to draw the attention of the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue and the Hon. the Chief Minister that the Congress party appointed an Agrarian Reforms Committee and that Agrarian Reforms Committee suggested a much smaller share to the landlord. The Subramanyam Committee took into consideration the Bombay Act and the suggestions of the Agrarian Reforms Committee also; on page 54 of their report, the Subramanyam Committee stated:

‘ In this State, taking it by and large, the proportion constituting rent for ordinary irrigated land has been more or less the same as for dry lands, and for wet lands under good sources of irrigation it has been higher. Back of this idea is the principle that for fertile lands, and particularly for wet lands under first-class sources of irrigation, since the effort required in cultivation is proportionately less, the tenant's share can properly be made proportionately less. We think this background will have to be retained in any scheme of fair rents which we may fix. Some sets of crops are raised both on wet lands and dry lands. While in most cases wet crops are raised on lands classified as wet, in some cases they are raised on lands which are classed as dry on payment of a suitable charge for water. It is better therefore to let the scheme of rent have relation to the crops. We agree with the Board of Revenue that commercial crops also should be brought under the scheme of fair rents.’

I have read out these few lines in order to impress upon the Government that the committee made a special distinction between first-class sources of irrigation and second-class sources of irrigation and commercial crops in arriving at the share on a somewhat realistic basis. Sir, if we look into the history of the fixation of this crop share, we will find that a Special Officer was appointed by the Government prior to the constitution of the Subramanyam Committee. That Special Officer fixed 55 per cent as the share of the landlord and the Board of Revenue reduced it to 50 per cent and the Subramanyam Committee came to the conclusion that the landlord should receive only 45 per cent. I am not going into greater detail over this matter. As the recommendations of the Special Officer, the suggestions of the Board of Revenue and the proportions fixed by the Bombay Government were all taken into consideration by the Subramanyam Committee, I submit, the Government should also, reading the spirit of the times, act upon the suggestions made in the Subramanyam Committee Report. It is reasonable to the tenant; it is reasonable to the landlord; and I believe the Congress Party Members should have absolutely no objection to accept them. As already stated by Sri P. Ramamurthi, two members of the Subrahmanyam Committee are actually Hon. Ministers to-day and they did not dissent from that share proportion. Excepting one dissenting minute by Sri B. Ramachandra Reddi, every other member of that committee agreed to this proportion; one of the biggest mirasdars of Tanjore was a member of the committee and he did not in his long dissenting minute, raise any objection to this proportion. I submit, therefore, Sir, that without going into actual costs of cultivation and the

27th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

family budgets of tenants and landlords of any category, all these considerations make it imperative on this House to accept the recommendations of the Subramanyam Committee.

"Sir, there is another point to which I would like to refer. This Subramaniam Committee was appointed by the previous Government and their report was before the previous Government and it is also under the consideration of the present Government. While the Report was under consideration, the Malabar Tenancy Act was amended and again the present legislation has come. Therefore, it is high time the Government should come to some conclusion and I believe there is no better opportunity than now to come to a conclusion at least on this portion of the Report. The proportion of shares is acceptable to most of the Members and I would ask the Government not to stand on points of prestige and not to drive us to a division. I would ask the Government therefore to satisfy themselves, the Members of the Opposition and also more important than all these, the large tenantry in the Tanjore district. It will give a lead to the entire State. Let us make a start with a good example."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
"Sir, excepting the hon. Member representing North Mathurai, almost all other Members, who spoke hail from a geographical area which is different from the one with which we are dealing. I am afraid they have no idea of the conditions prevailing in this district. Sir, they have been swearing so much by the Subramaniam Committee Report; but I wish to tell them that this Report was recommended to be applied to the entire State and not to Tanjore district in particular. Sir, this question was gone into very carefully and in great detail at the Select Committee stage. Excepting the hon. Gentlemen who dissented, all others agreed to this formula. And this formula goes a long way from the existing rent. In certain places, the existing rent is about one-fifth or so. In Kumbakonam and other places, it is about one-fifth and even in other places it is sufficiently lower."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, if the Hon. Minister does not mind my interruption, I would like to tell him that he should not take Kumbakonam as an example."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
"Sir, Kumbakonam may not be taken as an example for certain other purposes. But we can take it as an example for this purpose and there is no harm. Sir, the hon. Member was referring to election pledges and other things. Of course, this formula of crop share does not come up to the slogan of 5 acres of land, two bulls, a pukka house and a milch cow. (Laughter.) I submit, Sir, this share is based on justice, equity and good conscience. I oppose the amendment, Sir."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really at a loss to understand the reasoning of the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue. He has not met a single argument that has been advanced from this side that what is proposed in the Bill in this 5 p.m.

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [27th November 1952]

clause 8, which is the life clause, is not justice at all. It does not help the Government themselves who are saying from the house-tops—at least as seen from the books recently published—that they are working for the Tanjore tenants. Sir, I do not know to which profession the Hon. Minister belonged, but I am afraid that if he was a lawyer, he must have argued very poorly. I am not referring to him personally but to his arguments. What does he mean when he says that the rent that is fixed is sufficient for the tenant? Has he got any argument to show that Mr. Raghavendra Rao, the special officer, who was appointed by the Government, the Congress Agrarian Reform Committee, which in fact was a committee belonging to the party of the Government, and the Land Revenue Reforms Committee—all these persons and committees have made a mistake, that they have not gone into the *pros and cons* of this problem of rent for the tenant? Sir, he has not answered that point at all. He simply dismissed it by saying that they had in their minds the whole State of Madras. He could have as well said they had in their mind the whole world. Well, if they had in their mind the whole State of Madras, surely Tanjore is a part of that State. Does he mean to say that they had in their minds the State of Madras excluding Tanjore? If now the Government are saying that Tanjore is a special problem, it is a special problem both from the viewpoint of the relationship between the tenant and the landlord and also from the viewpoint of the Government themselves, and this is the problem that has to be dealt with straightaway now. If Tanjore has attracted the attention of this Government—the first Government that has been formed after the adult franchise—surely they must admit that when the Land Reforms Committee or the Special Officer, Mr. Raghavendra Rao, fixed a certain proportion as the rent for the tenant, they must have had in their minds the worst case, viz., that of the Tanjore district. Therefore, I am afraid that the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue is missing the bus. In fact, he is bringing about, through this Bill, a still-born child. A member from the other side has already said that they are just going to maintain the *status quo*. That is true; they are just going to maintain the *status quo*. But that does not help our countrymen. Let not our countrymen feel that they have a Government here which wants to maintain the *status quo* of starvation, to maintain the *status quo* of rack-rent. I submit there is still time for the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue to change his opinion and to change it in the manner—not of what we want him to do—in which his own officers themselves want him to do, with regard to the question of the fixation of rent.

“With these words, Sir, I close my speech; thank you, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“Sir, I have nothing more to add to what I have said; but I want to say this much; I admit that I do not belong to the profession to which the hon. Member who spoke just now belongs at present. (An hon. Member: ‘What is it?’) Whatever it

27th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

is, as already stated, this is not a very broad or general Land Reform Bill. It is only a special Bill relating to a particular area. We have taken a long stride in this matter; let us see how it works; we need not precipitate matters at this stage."

MR. SPEAKER :—" There are several amendments. I shall put them to vote one by one. The first is Mr. Gopalan's amendment. The question is—

' In sub-clause (1) for the word " two-fifths ", substitute the word " two-thirds ".'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The second is Mr. Kune Rao's amendment. The question is—

' In sub-clause (1), for the word " two-fifths ", substitute the word " eleven-twentieths ".'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The next amendment is that of Mr. T. Lakshminarayana Reddi. The question is—

' In line 3 of sub-clause (1), for the word " two-fifths " substitute the word " three-fifths ".'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The last amendment is the amendment of Mr. C. V. K. Rao. The question is—

' In sub-clause (1), for the words " the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths ", substitute the words " the tenant shall be entitled to 55 per cent under first-class irrigation sources, 60 per cent under second-class irrigation sources and 60 per cent in all commercial crops whether raised on wet or dry lands ".'

The amendment was declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

5-10
p.m.

Ayes.

Sri M. Muni Reddi.
" A. Neeladri Rao Reddi.
" K. V. Ramesam.
" P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
" M. Srungaram.
" M. Pentannaidu.
" M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" S. Pakkiriswami Pillai.
" K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
" K. Venkatakurmi Naidu.
" G. Suryanarayana.
" M. Kalyanasundaram.
" K. T. Raju.
" K. P. Gopalan.
" C. Kandaswami.
" V. Madanagopal.
" S. Ramalingam.
" N. Sivaraj.
" A. K. Subbiah.
" K. V. Ramaswamy.

Sri T. S. Ardhanari.
" P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
" P. Narasimha Reddi.
" N. Sivarami Reddi.
" D. Seetharamiah.
" C. H. Kanaran.
" K. Madhavan Nambiar.
" R. Krishnan.
" E. T. Kuphan.
" M. Hanumantha Rao.
" C. V. K. Rao.
" K. Rajagopala Rao.
" P. Venkatasiviah.
" P. Rama Rao.
" V. Rama Rao.
" T. Potha Raju.
" P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
" K. Malakondayya.
" M. Narayanaswamy.
" K. Venkaiah.

[27th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. Syamasundara Rao.
 „ B. Lakshminarasu Raju.
 „ G. Satyanarayana.
 „ G. Anjaneyalu.
 „ G. Joseph.
 „ D. Lakshmayya.
 „ M. Kune Rao.
 „ G. Nageshwara Rao.
 „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
 „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
 „ K. Ranga Rao.
 „ K. Subba Reddi.
 „ Chandra Ramalingayya.
 „ C. Prabhakara Choudary.
 „ G. Rama Rao.
 „ K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Veerabhadram.
 „ K. Vinayakam.
 „ M. Palaniandi.
 „ K. Krishna Rao.
 „ A. Veloo.
 „ M. P. Subramaniam.
 „ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
 „ N. Paramasivam.
 „ Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ M. Manjeka Sundaram.
 Dr. G. Chitrabalam.
 Sri B. Sankarappa.
 „ K. R. Sambandam.
 „ S. Kasi Reddy.
 „ P. Chokkalingham.
 „ Saka Venkata Rao.

Sri T. Nagi Reddi.
 „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
 „ S. Deivasigamony.
 „ Bojja Appalasamy.
 „ A. Rathinam.
 „ D. Dasarathan.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ R. Siddanna Gowd.
 „ K. Ramiah Chowdry.
 „ G. Bapanayya.
 „ Y. V. Krishna Rao.
 „ P. Kunhirama Kidav.
 „ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
 „ K. Bapanna Dora.
 „ K. Ramiah.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
 „ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
 „ C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ T. Viswanatham.
 „ P. Ramamurthi.
 „ P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.
 „ V. K. Gopalakrishnan.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
 „ M. Palanimuthu.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ V. Sankaranarayanan Menon.
 „ K. T. Sridharan.
 „ M. Narayana Kurup.
 „ M. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ O. Koran.
 „ G. Yellamunda Reddy.

Noes.

The Hon Sri C. Subramaniam.
 „ Sri A. B. Shetty.
 „ Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
 „ Dr U. Krishna Rao.
 Sri K. Rajaram.
 „ B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
 „ C. Rajam Ramaswami.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.
 „ S. C. Virupakshayya.
 „ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
 „ P. G. Manickam.
 „ R. Kuppuswami.
 „ P. K. Thirumurthi.
 „ V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
 „ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
 „ A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
 „ P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
 „ S. B. Arumugham.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ Kempai Gounder.
 „ T. M. Kaliannan.
 „ M. P. Periaswami.
 „ Ardhanareswara Gounder.
 „ A. Sambasivam.
 „ Lakshmana Kandar.
 „ P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishna Nayar.
 „ Dr. R. Nagana Goud
 Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ K. Koti Reddi.

Sri A. M. Sambandam.
 „ M. R. Ramachandran.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ B. Parameswaran.
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
 „ T. P. Elumalai.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ A. J. Arunachalam.
 „ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.
 Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.
 Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
 „ L. Anandan.
 „ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
 „ G. Vagheesam Pillay.
 „ A. S. Sahajanandam.
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.
 „ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
 „ S. Arumugham.
 „ K. S. Subramania Gounder.
 „ A. M. Ratnaswami.
 Janab Mahomed Salih Maraikayar.
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswamy Gounder.
 „ K. Venkataswami Naidu.
 „ N. Sankara Reddi.
 „ D. Sanjivayya.
 „ Shanmuga Rajeswara
 Sethupathi, the Raja of
 Ramnad.
 „ S. B. P. Pattabhi Ram
 Rao.

27th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Srimathi (Dr.) T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.

Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
" C. Chinnaswami Naidu.
" S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.
" V. S. Sivaprakasam.
" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" Thinakaranaswami Thevar.
" R. Krishnasami Naidu.
" S. Jayaram Reddiar.
" Vaikuntam.
" G. Govindan.
" P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
" S. Ramasami Naidu.
" Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
" P. Chellathurai.
" N. Rajagopal.
" A. Ramasami Thevar.
" T. K. Rama.
" T. V. Sannasi.
" Antony Peter.
" T. R. Varadan.
" C. Muthiah Pillay.
" Thiagaraja Pillay.
" S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
" R. V. Swaminathan.
" I. K. Subramania Pillai.
" K. T. Kosalram.
" P. Urkavalan.
" R. S. K. Pandian.
" M. G. Shanker.
" S. Somayajulu.
" Chinnathambi Thevar.
" P. Selvaraj.
" V. Arumugham.
" K. Ramasamy Doss.
" R. S. Arumugham.
" A. Venkatramiah.
" A. Rami Reddi.
" N. Chenchurama Naidu.
" P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
" K. Shanmugham.
" P. Venkataswami Reddi.
" Muthukumarasamy.
" G. Narayanasamy Naidu.
" S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.

Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju.

Sri Thota Ramasamy.
" P. Satyanarayana Reddi.
" V. C. Chudamani Deo.
" A. Venkatasubramaniam.
" P. Gunayya.
" L. Lakshmana Das.
" K. Suryanarayana.
" H. Satyanarayana Dora.
" T. C. Atchannaidu.
" K. V. Vema Reddi.
" S. Narayanappa.
" K. Santhappa.
" P. Ranga Reddi.
" A. Appu.
" B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
" K. Varadachari.
" D. Ramabrahmam.
" K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
" M. Doraikannu.
" H. Ramalinga Reddi.
" G. Nagabhushanam.
" Kotra Basavana Goud.
" S. Parameswarappa.
" T. Mallayya.
" T. Anantha Pai.
" Y. Manjappa Shetty.
" K. Venkatramana Gowda.
" N. N. Suvama.
" M. Jagannatham.
" E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
" B. Vaikunta Baliga.
Janab M. S. Mogral.
Sri T. Chinnayya.
" L. C. Pais.
Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
Sri K. Veeranna Padal.
" R. Lakshminarasimham.
" Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.
" K. Ramamurthy.
" Ch. Indrayya.
" N. Rathina Gounder.
" M. Chadayan.
Janab C. Ahmed Kutty.
" Kunhi Mohamed Shafao.
" K. M. Seethi.
Sri G. Samia Koorayar.

5-20
p.m.

Ayes 106, Noes 155.

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"On a point of information, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Sri Subramaniam has voted against Mr. Subramaniam. I would like to have his explanation." (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Hon. Members, Sri Venkateswarlu, Sri Ramamurthi and Sri Kandaswami have given notice of amendments on the same lines. One of them may move the amendment and the rest may speak upon it."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sri Kandaswami will move the amendment, Sir."

[27th November 1952]

SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! என் பெயரில் இருக்கின்ற திருத்தத்தை நான் பிரேரிக்கிறேன். அந்தத் திருத்தம் என்னவென்றால்—

‘ (i) In sub-clause (1) for the words within brackets, substitute the following :—

“ or 20 per cent increase over his existing customary share percentage, whichever is more beneficial to the tenant ”,

and also omit the words in the third paragraph of sub-clause (1), beginning with the words “ and no portion of the produce ” up to the end of the paragraph.’

“ தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் திருத்தம் மிகவும் நியாயமானது, அவசியமானது என்பதை யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாதென்பதை முதலில் தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்லலாமென்று இருக்கிறேன். ஏற்கெனவே சர்க்கார் தரப்பினரால் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டு சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபார்சை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டுதான் இன்றையதினம் இந்தத் திருத்தம் பிரேரிக் கப்படுகிறது. சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் அங்கத்தினராக இருந்தவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் மந்திரி சபையிலும் இருவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் யாரும் எதிர்ப்புக்கிடையில் இருப்பவர்கள் குழப்பத்தை உண்டாக்காமல் மந்திரி திருத்தத்தைப் பிரேரிப்பதாகக் கருதுகூடாது. திருத்தத்திலுள்ள வாசகத்தை நன்கு படிக்கவேண்டும். அதேசமயம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் பலதரப்பட்ட வாரம் இன்றையதினம் அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டு வருகிற தென்பதையும் நாம் மறந்துவிடக்கூடாது. திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, கும்பகோணம் தாலுக்காவில் 16 வாரம், 20 வாரம் அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கலாம். அதேசமயம் நாகைப்பட்டினம், திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி, மன்னார் குடி தாலுக்காக்களில் தற்பொழுது நாம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிற 40% வாரம் ஏற்கெனவேயே அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. இன்னும் சில இடங்களில் இதைவிட அதிகமாகவும் இருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் இன்றையதினம் யாதொருவிதமான நன்மையும் கிடையாது. திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியில் 16 வாரம் வாங்கியவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது 40 வாரம் கிடைக்குமென்று சொல்வது நியாயம். அதேபோல் கும்பகோணம், பாபநாசம் தாலுக்காவிலுள்ளவர்களுக்கு 20, 22% வாரம் வாங்கியவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது 40 வாரம் கிடைக்குமென்றால் சரியானது. ஆனால் முன்பே 40% டோ அல்லது அதற்கு அதிகமாக வாங்கிக் கொண்டு வந்திருந்தவர்களுக்கும் இப்பொழுது 40% தான் வாரம் என்றால் அது சரியா? நியாயமா? அங்குள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு நாம் நீதி செய்வதாக ஆகுமா? என்பதையெல்லாம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்த்தாகவேண்டும். விவசாய இயக்கத்தில் சிஎஸ்சி செய்தவர்கள் அவர்கள்தான். மிராசதாரர்களால் பழிவாங்கப்பட்டவர்களும் அவர்கள்தான். அவர்களுக்கு இன்றையதினம் சரியாக நியாயம் வழங்காவிட்டால் அவர்களிடையே இன்றையதினம் இருக்கும் அதிருப்தி என்றைக்கும் இருந்துகொண்டேதான் இருக்கும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவதன் நோக்கமே, விவசாயிகள், மிராசதாரர்களிடையே இருந்துவந்த தகராறுகளையெல்லாம் போக்கி, அவர்களிடையே நல்லுறவை வளர்த்து உற்பத்தி அதிகப்படுத்துவதாகத்தான் என்பதாகக் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படி இருக்கும்பொழுது இப்பொழுது ஒரேவாரியாக ஒரு வாரத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்தால் அதனால் எல்லோருடைய குறைகளும் தீர்ந்துவிடுமென்று கருதினால் இது நாம் செய்யும் முட்டாள்தனமான காரியம் என்றுதான் நான் வருத்தத்துடன் சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இதைப்பற்றி பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியிலும் நான் பல விஷயங்களை எடுத்துச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன். இங்கும் அதையேதான் சொல்லுகிறேன். நியாயமாக எல்லாப்பகுதிகளிலுமுள்ள விவசாயிகள் நன்மை அடையத்தக்கவகையில் நாம் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டியது நம் கடமையாகும். அதற்காகத்தான் இந்தத் திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறேன். கும்பகோணத்திலுள்ள 20% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளுக்

27th November 1952][Sri C. Kandaswami]

கும், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியிலுள்ள 16% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கும், இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் 40% வாரம் கிடைக்கும் என்று நாம் சந்தோஷப்படுமபொழுது இந்தச் சட்டத்திற்கு முன்னேய் 35%, 40% வாரம் வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருந்த மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தரைப்புண்டி பக்கத்திலுள்ள 5, 6 தாலுக்கா வாசிகளுக்கு எந்தவிதமான ஆதாயமும் கிடையாது என்னும்பொழுது வருந்தாமல் இருக்கமுடியாது. ஆகவேதான் இத்திருத்தத்தை ஒப்புக்கொண்டால் அவர்களுக்கும் கொஞ்சம் வாரம் கிடைக்கும். இது நியாயமா, அநியாயமா என்பதை வேண்டுமானால் நீங்கள் எல்லோரும் பரிசீலனை செய்துபாருங்கள். ஆங்காங்கேயுள்ள சர்க்கார் ரெவினியூ உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களுக்கும் தாக்கீது அனுப்பி அவர்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயங்களைக் கேட்டுப்பார்க்கலாம். இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் உண்மையில் சில தாலுக்கா விவசாயிகளுக்கு லாபமே கிடையாது. திருத்தரைப்புண்டி தாலுக்காவில் நிலம் அதிகமாகக் கேட்கலாமே தவிர பாசன வசதியில்லாததால் ஒன்றும் பலனில்லை. கும்பகோணம், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி தாலுக்காவில் நிலம் குறைவாகத்தான் கிடைக்கும். இருந்தாலும் பாசன வசதி அதிகமாதலால் நிலத்தில் போட்டி அதிகம். நிலமும் ஒரு விவசாயிக்கு கொஞ்சம் தான் கிடைக்கும். இங்கே செலவும் குறைவு. ஆக மொத்தமாகக் கணக்குப் பார்த்தால் இன்றையதினம் 16%, 20% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளும், 40%, 45% வாரம் வாங்கிவரும் விவசாயிகளும் ஒரே நிலையில் தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கஷ்ட நிலைமை ஒரே நிலையில்தான் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. குறைவான வாரம் வாங்குபவர்களைவிட அதிக வாரம் வாங்குபவர்கள் குறிப்பாக மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்களே தவிர ஒன்றும் மேலான நிலைமையில் இன்றையதினம் இல்லை. ஆகவேதான் எல்லோருக்கும் ஒரேவாரம் என்று இருப்பதைவிட அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது வாங்கிவரும் வாரத்திற்குமேல் 20% அதிகம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அதனால் நிச்சயமாகப் பல ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகளுக்கு அதிகமான நன்மையேற்படுமென்பதை நாம் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளத்தான் வேண்டும். பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் சொன்ன விஷயங்களையும், பலரும் இந்தச் சபையில் சொல்லிய விஷயங்களையே நான் சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்க விரும்பவில்லை. எந்த இடத்தில் கிளர்ச்சி நடந்தது, அவர்களுடைய குறைகள் என்ன? இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் அவர்களுடைய குறைகள் ஓரளவாவது நீக்கப்படுகிறதா என்பதையெல்லாம் நாம் கவனித்துப்பார்த்தாகவேண்டும். எதோ ஒப்புக்காக ஒரு சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தோம் என்று கொண்டுவந்துவிட்டால் போதாது. சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபார்சுகள் என்னவென்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அக்கமிட்டியின் குறைந்தபட்ச சிபார்சுகளையாவது நாம் அமுலாக்காவிட்டால் ஒரு கமிட்டியை நியமித்து விஷயங்களை ஆராய்ச்சி செய்ததின் அவசியம் என்ன ஏற்பட்டது என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி ரொம்பவும் பிரமாதமானதோர் சிபார்சை செய்துவிட்டவில்லை. மிகக் குறைந்த சிபார்சுகளைத்தான் செய்திருக்கிறது. அந்த கமிட்டியிலுள்ள அங்கத்தினர்களைப் பார்த்தாலேயே அவர்கள் அதைவிட ஒன்றும் சிபார்சு செய்ய மாட்டார்கள் என்பது தெரியும். எல்லோரும் ஒரு ஆயிரம் ஏக்கருக்கு மேற்பட்ட மிராசுதார்கள். அதோடு கமிட்டியில் சாட்சியம் கூற வந்தவர்களும் கூட அந்த ஜாப்தாவை எடுத்துப்பார்த்தால் தெரியும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வேலி நிலங்களை உடையவர்கள். சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியும் தலைவர்கள்கொண்டேயே இருந்த காலத்தில், விவசாயப் பிரதிநிதிகளின் யோசனைகளைக் கேட்காமலேயே அந்த சிபார்சுகளைச் செய்திருக்கிறதென்றால் நாட்டில் இருந்த நிலைமை என்னவென்பதை அவர்கள் உணர்ந்தே அப்படி செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இதை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் நன்றி யோசித்துப் பார்த்தால் நன்றாகத் தெரியும். இதில் கட்சிப் போராட்டங்களுக்கு இடமேயில்லை. கட்சி மனப்பான்மையை அப்புறம் எடுத்து வைத்துவிட்டு விவசாயிகளின் நலனில் உண்மையாக கிரத்தைகொண்டு பார்த்தால் நான் பிரேரித்திருக்கின்ற திருத்தம் மிகவும் அவசியமானது, நியாயமானது என்பது முதலில் சொன்னபடி. உங்களுக்குப் புரியும். ஆகவே இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை மிகவும் வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்லி இதை சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டும், சபையினரும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய திருத்தத்தைப் பிரேரிக்கிறேன்”.

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the amendment that has been moved by Mr. Manali Kandaswami. While seconding the amendment, I would like to point out certain basic principles underlying it. The Government have not accepted the recommendation of the Subramaniam Committee with reference to the percentage of share. But there is one basic principle underlying that Report and it has got a basis. That report made a distinction between what are called ‘ First-class lands ’ and ‘ Second-class lands. ’ In the case of ‘ First-class lands ’—due to the fertility of the soil, due to the availability of water and other circumstances prevailing in the various places—it proposed that the proportion should be in the ratio of 55 and 45. In the case of ‘ Second-class lands ’ it should be in the ratio of 60 and 40. That itself implies that a distinction ought to be made. So long as there is a system of sharing the crop or the system of contract—‘ kuthagai ’ as it is called—the tenant who is working on a more fertile soil may be able to get a lower proportion of the share than a tenant working on a less fertile soil for the labour that he actually expends. Therefore, in order to enable peasants who put in the same amount of labour to get more or less the same amount of remuneration, it proposed a certain different approach to the whole problem. Now, the Government may have their own difficulties. They may come forward with their own reasons for not accepting the percentages laid down by the Subramaniam Committee. I would now ask them, what is the reason behind their refusing to accept this different approach? It is well-known that in the district of Tanjore there are taluks like Papanasam, Kumbakonam, Tanjore and Sirkali—the last of which has got the Rajan Channel Irrigation—which are fertile. There, three crops are grown on the same kind of land and peasants will be able to produce more crops. But if you take the other taluks of the Tanjore district like Pattukkottai, Mannargudi, Nannilam and Mayuram, you will find an entirely different state of affairs prevailing there. There the soil is more difficult to till. It is more hard and there is not enough water available and it is less fertile. Therefore, even the existing proportion of the share in those taluks is higher than the existing proportion in the other taluks. This is a custom that has been prevalent from time immemorial, that is, ever since the system of crop-sharing has been in existence. In Mannargudi, for example, for a *mah* of land the *kuttagai* is about six kalamas, whereas in the other taluks the *kuttagai* is 25 to 30 kalamas. It is a case of difference in the fertility of the soil. This thing, the Subramaniam Committee has recognized; and when that Committee has recognized it, why should not that differential approach be adopted here also?

5-40
p.m.

“ The second point I would like to urge is, what does the Preamble of this Bill itself say? It says :

“ Whereas in the district of Tanjore the relations between land-owners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other hand had become strained, resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances; etc.”

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

So, Sir, it is in order to put an end to that state of affairs this Bill has been brought forward. Sir, where is it this agrarian unrest has been most acute? This agrarian unrest has been acute in the taluks of Mannargudi, Tirutturaipundi and Nannilam, and these taluks being the least fertile areas, the peasants were not getting anything at all. Why should the proportion of those who are now getting a higher rate be different from those who are tilling less fertile lands? Hence it is the unrest was acute where the proportion of the tenants was low. Now if the intention of the Government is really to put an end to this unrest, if the intention of the Government is to see that the peasants are satisfied, then, immediately the Government should come forward to satisfy them. I ask, 'Is this the way of satisfying them; is this the way of putting an end to that unrest, by saying that as you were all under the influence of the Communists, you will not get anything more, you will not get a single grain of paddy more than what you are getting to-day?' Surely this is not the object of this Bill, and so I submit to Government to translate their object into reality.

'Then, Sir, the amendment suggested by Mr. Kandaswami is a very reasonable one. He wants to give a flat rate of increase over the existing share in all the areas irrespective of what exactly it has been all along there. What is the danger in adopting this suggestion? What other conclusion can we draw for the opposition to this amendment except the fact that those three areas were under the influence of Communists and so they should not get any benefit in the proportion of the sharing of the crop? I say, 'Do not adopt an attitude of political victimization; do not look at the problem from the point of view that they are peasants who have been under the influence of the Communists, and were carrying the struggle under the influence of the Communists.' Do not say, 'You have been under the influence of the Communists and therefore I will not do anything for you.' I say, let not that be the attitude of the Hon. Chief Minister. On the other hand, let the Hon. Chief Minister come forward and translate the very Preamble of the Bill, the very letter of the Preamble into action and make the peasants feel that the Bill carries out the very object for which this measure has been brought forward and that it does not remain a dead letter. The proportion in the sharing of the crop that is asked for is much lower than that recommended by the Subramaniam Committee. It does not ask for 55 per cent. Therefore, I submit, there should be no difficulty in accepting the amendment of Mr. Kandaswami. I therefore commend it to the acceptance of the entire House and particularly of the Hon. Chief Minister.'

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, this subject was thoroughly discussed in the Joint Select Committee, where, the mover of this amendment was also an active member and whose assistance I constantly sought in finalizing matters there. I am grateful for the help he rendered. I do not object to his bringing up amendments now. But why I refer to it is this: that we have thoroughly discussed this matter before. The object of having select committees, joint or otherwise, is to sift

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

details like the one that is now under discussion, and not to go through the whole process in the Select Committee stage first and again in the open Assembly here. We have already gone into such details. We have discussed details like this in the Joint Select Committee, whether it should be two-fifths or three-fifths or eleven-twentieths and so on. Sir, I did not intervene in the debate on the previous clause. But now I rise because certain general arguments have been put forward including some political arguments. The general argument is that some lands are more fertile than other lands, and therefore there should be a differentiation in the sharing of the crops. Now I submit in all humility that this is a wrong argument. Mr. Ramamurti may know more about the peasants' case, but I am not quite ignorant of the general principles applicable to lands. If a land is more fertile it does not affect the share of the landlord or the share of the tenant. Both share in the fertility and both share in the infertility. The difficulty of tilling was referred to. There I could notice that Mr. Ramamurti did not stay long, because there was no substance in that argument. He was conscious of it; otherwise he would have dwelt on it at length. There is no difference in the difficulties of the labourers, in the different areas of the district. The difference is in the irrigation facilities; the difference is in fertility. Both share the benefit. Now what is the effect of this differentiation in fertility? It has an effect on the price of land. If land is more fertile in Tirukkattupalli or Kumbakonam area, on account of the land being at the head and not at the tail end of the channel, land value there goes up. The man who buys or sells land, pays or gets more money for the same acreage. It does not affect anything else. It increases the amount that has to be invested to get a particular return, which a fertile land gives. Whereas in the tail end, in Tirutturaipundi, land is cheaper; because fertility is not so good. But so far as tenants and landlords are concerned, with reference to their relative rights and liabilities and with reference to the outturn, they are sharing according to custom and practice there.

"Now, Mr. Ramamurti was saying, very rightly, that in Kumbakonam and Tirukkattupalli areas the share was much less to the tenant, and the share of the tenant in those parts for which Mr. Ramamurti and Mr. Kandasami are now pleading in particular was much more all the time. Now this sharing differentiation arose out of custom and out of other factors. I appeal to the House that we should not make such differentiation now. When we give a certain benefit to the areas where there was unrest, we should not deny that benefit to the tenants who did not participate in that unrest. Otherwise that would be paying a price for unrest; we would be bribing unrest, so to say. Unrest had merely brought matters to the forefront. We must appease unrest. Unrest in one area will spread to another area so long as men are active and act according to natural forces and desires. To give to those areas where there was unrest, more, and to give less to those areas where there was no unrest, I submit, would be wrong. That is why, I explained to Mr. Kandasami, even in the Joint Select Committee that we cannot agree

27th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

to make such differentiations. It is true that my friends on the other side were mostly active in the area for which they are now pleading, but for that reason, we should not give more favourable terms to that area than to the areas where they did not operate. If unrest did not spread to other areas, perhaps it is because numbers limited their operations. If they were larger in numbers, they would have operated in other areas also. Then, I have no doubt, there would have been no special plea for any particular area. Unfortunately or fortunately—unfortunately for some and fortunately for others, concentration of unrest was in a particular area, for in that particular area the concentration was easier for several reasons. It is easier to operate on people who are in distress; those who are hungrier and those who are poorer are easier material for fomenting unrest. It is therefore for that reason Government are asked to give more relatively to that area by raising the old percentages of sharing and not to give equal advantage to all. To ask to give more by just raising the percentage, so that the tenants' share in areas where there was unrest may continue to be bigger is merely asking us to pay a price for unrest, to which, I submit, Government cannot agree."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. The Hon. the Chief Minister has misunderstood what I stated. The Hon. the Chief Minister stated that we are pleading for the people in a particular area. Sir, we do not plead that the people in certain areas should be given more than the people in other areas at all. All that we say is 'give a uniform percentage of increase to all sections of the people.' Therefore, there is no question of favour or disfavour to a certain set of people; there is only the question of equality to all people. We say, if you want to give, give to all people. That is what we have been pleading, and not what the Hon. Chief Minister sought to make out."

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களை பொறுக் குக் கமிட்டியில் இதைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்கப்பட்டது உண்மைதான். அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் இதைப்பற்றி ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரமுடியவில்லை, அதை ஒத்தக்கொள்ள சர்க்கார் சார்பிலுள்ளவர்கள் மறுத்துவிட்டார்கள் என்பதும் உண்மைதான். அதைக் கொண்டுதான் இந்தப் பொதுச் சபையில் இதைப் பற்றி இப்பொழுது பேசவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டது என்பதைச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். வேறு ஒரு காரணத்திற்காகவும் இல்லை. கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட காரணங்களைக் கேட்பிற்கும்கூட என்னை பொறுத்தவரையில் அவை திருப்திப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே இல்லையென்றுதான் நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன். ஏனென்று கேட்டால், உதாரணமாக நான் சொல்லுகிறேன், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, தஞ்சாவூர் போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள நிலத்தின் விலை அதிகம், ஆனால், மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தரைப்பூண்டி போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள நிலத்தின் விலை குறைவு. அதைப்போலவே, அங்கு இருக்கின்ற நிலத்தில் விளைவு அதிகம், இங்கு இருக்கின்ற நிலத்தின் விளைவும் குறைவு என்பதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியில் நிலம் மிகவும் அதிகமான விலையாக இருப்பதனாலும், அதில் விளையக்கூடிய தானியம் அதிகமாக இருப்பதனாலும், பொதுவாக ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமாக இருப்பதனாலும், நிலத்திற்கு அதிகமான கிராக்கி ஏற்படுகிறது. அதனால் குடியானவர்களுக்கு கிடைக்கும் நிலத்தின் விஸ்தீரணமும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது. அதே சந்தர்ப்

5-50
p.m.

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [27th November 1952]

பத்தில் மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி போன்ற இடங்களில் நீர்ப்பாசன வசதி இல்லாமையால் நிலம் அதிகமாகக் கிடைக்கிறது. நிலத்தில் விளைவும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது. ஆக, மொத்தமாகப் பார்க்கப்போனால், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகள் 16% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும், தஞ்சாவூர், கும்பகோணம் விவசாயிகள் 22% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும், திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி, மன்னார்குடி விவசாயிகள் 40% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும் இவர்களுடைய நிலைமையெல்லாம் ஒரே மாதிரியாக இருக்கிறதே தவிர, தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகளைவிட, மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி விவசாயிகள் எந்த விதத்திலும் மேலான நிலைமையில் இல்லை. இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகள் 40% வாரம் கிடைப்பதால் அதிக நன்மை அடையலாமே தவிர, தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, விவசாயிகளைப்போலவே கஷ்டத்தினால் இருந்துவந்த மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்த விதத்திலும் ஆதாயம் கிடையாது. அவர்கள் முன்போலவே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அக்குறையை நீக்கவே இந்த திருத்தத்தை கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த அடிப்படையில் பார்த்தால்தான் உண்மை நிலவரம் நமக்குத் தெரியும். நிலவளம் அதிகமுள்ள இடங்களிலும் நிலவளமற்ற இடங்களிலும் உள்ள விவசாயிகளுடைய நிலைமை அவர்கள் பெற்றுவரும் வாரத்தில் வித்தியாசம் காணப்பட்டாலும் வாழ்க்கை அடிப்படையில் வித்தியாசம் இல்லை. ஆதலால்தான் ஒரேயடியாக 40% என்பதைக்காட்டிலும் எல்லா இடத்திலுமுள்ள விவசாயிகள் நன்மையடையும்படி இச்சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

“எதோ நாங்கள் அங்கு வேலை செய்த இடம்; நாங்கள் அங்கு விவசாயிகளைத் திரட்டி போராட்டங்கள் நடத்தியிருக்கிறோம்; ஆகவே, அந்தப் பிரதேசத்திலுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு மற்ற இடத்தவர்களைவிட அதிக வாரம் கொடுக்கவில்லை என்று நாங்கள் சர்க்காரைக் குற்றஞ்சாட்டவில்லை. அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் அங்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய அமைதியின்மைக்கு வெகும்தியாகவும் கோரவில்லை. அமைதியின்மை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லும்போது, அந்த அமைதியின்மை ஏற்படுவதற்குக் காரணமாக அங்கு ஒரு சூழ்நிலை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை யாரும் மறக்கமுடியாது. வர்க்க நல்லுறவை வளர்க்கக்கூடியவர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி வர்க்க வேற்றுமையை வளர்க்க கூடியவர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய யதார்த்த நிலைமையை, அதாவது material conditions-ஐ அனுசரித்து காரியத்தைச் செய்தால்தான் நல்ல நிலைமை ஏற்படுமே தவிர இல்லாவிட்டால் ஏற்படாது. ஆகவே, அரசாங்கம் இதுவரையிலும் நடந்தவைகளையெல்லாம் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாமல், உண்மையாகவே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மை ஏற்படுமா இல்லையா என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டுமே தவிர, அம்மாதிரியான அரசியல் விஷயங்களை இதிலே கொண்டுவந்து புகுத்தக்கூடாதென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இது அரசியல் கட்சிகளுக்கு அப்பாற்பட்ட விஷயம். ஆனால் நிலத்தில் உரிமை என்பதை ஏற்று இடத்தில் தீர்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டிய விஷயம். அது மக்கள் மத்தியில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டு அவர்களால் தீர்ப்புக் கூறப்பட வேண்டிய விஷயம்.

“மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தறைப்பூண்டி தாலுகாக்களிலுள்ள விவசாயிகள் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய வார விசிடம் சம்பந்தமாக அவர்கள் நிச்சயமாகக் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். இன்றைக்கு இந்தச் சட்டமானது அவர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது ஆதாயம் அளித்திருக்கிறதா, இல்லையா என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் நான் இதை வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்லுகிறேன். மீண்டும் போசீன செய்துபார்த்தால், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இந்த 40 : 60 விசிடம் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கும் சாதாரண குடியானவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் வழங்கக்கூடியதாக இல்லை, இன்னும் சில மாதங்கள் கழித்து அதை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் உணரவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்படும் என்று தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை வற்புறுத்த விரும்புகிறேன்.”

27th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Sir, I am glad about the welcome change in the hon. Gentleman who spoke on this amendment and who come from that area. In fact, the mover of the amendment raised this point at the Joint Select Committee where he was more eloquent than here. All the same, the Joint Select Committee by a majority took a different view and the hon. the Mover and others who dissented have appended their minutes of dissent. I, therefore, do not wonder that in pursuance of their dissenting views they are moving this amendment here. I submit, Sir, that this sharing of 60 : 40 was based, having as the starting point the Mayuram Award. We did not have very much in our mind the Report of the Subramaniam Committee and, as the schedule would show, we very much depended on the Mayuram Award. As far as the limited scope of this Bill goes, I think it is but right that we based the proportions of the respective shares on this Award. Of course, if it were to come up as a general question of land reform, we would have looked into the Subramaniam Committee Report and not based the proportions on the limited scope of the Mayuram Award. I, therefore, request the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, on a point of information, I would like to tell the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue that the Mayuram Award granted an over-all increase of 5 per cent over the existing *varam* throughout the district. It was not a percentage sharing at all.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ In sub-clause (1) for the words within brackets, *substitute* the following :—

“ or 20 per cent increase over his existing customary share percentage; whichever is more beneficial to the tenant ”.

and also *omit* the words in the third paragraph of sub-clause (1), beginning with the words “ and no portion of the produce . . . ” up to the end of the paragraph.”

The amendment was lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Sir, what about my amendment?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has not given notice of any amendment to this sub-clause.”

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Tuesday, 2nd December 1952.

The House then adjourned.